The JOURNAL *of* SOUTHERN HISTORY

Board of Editors

JOHN D. BARNHART
CHARLES W. RAMSDELL
AVERY O. CRAVEN
WALTER B. POSEY
WILLIAM O. LYNCH
PHILIP DAVIDSON
FRANK L. OWSLEY
W. NEIL FRANKLIN

Managing Editor
WENDELL H. STEPHENSON

Editorial Associate
FRED C. COLE

VOLUME V
FEBRUARY-NOVEMBER, 1939

Published Quarterly by the Southern Historical Association

CONTENTS OF VOLUME V

ARTICLES

The Records of Southern History. Philip M. Hamer 3

Culture Versus Frontier in Tennessee, 1825-1850. F. Garvin Davenport 18

The People, William Goebel, and the Kentucky Railroads. Thomas D. Clark 34

New Viewpoints of Southern Reconstruction. Francis B. Simkins 49

The Fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Historical Association. Philip Davidson 62

Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer. Fletcher M. Green 76

The Contribution of Walter Lynwood Fleming to Southern Scholarship. William C. Binkley 143

Southern Investments in Northern Lands before the Civil War. Paul Wallace Gates 155

"The First Northern Victory." Fred Harvey Harrington 186

The Slave Insurrection Panic of 1856. Harvey Wish 206

The "Turner Theories" and the South. Avery Craven 291

The Effects of the Civil War on the Louisiana Sugar Industry. Walter Prichard 315

Cultural Factors in the History of the South. Richard H. Shryock 333

The American Society of Equity in Kentucky: A Recent Attempt in Agrarian Reform. Theodore Saloutos 347

Bennet H. Barrow, Ante-Bellum Planter of the Felicianas. Edwin Adams Davis 431

John M. Berrien and the Administration of Andrew Jackson. Thomas P. Govan 447

The Relations between Judah P. Benjamin and Jefferson Davis. Robert Douthat Meade 468

The Indian Frontier in South Carolina as Seen by the S. P. G. Missionary. Frank J. Klingberg 479

Nathaniel A. Ware, National Economist. William Diamond 501

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

The John Tobler Manuscripts: An Account of German-Swiss Emigrants in South Carolina, 1737. Edited by Charles G. Cordle 83

Cyrus Griffin's Plan of Reconciliation with the American Colonies. Edited by Henry S. Rorer 98

Slater Fund Beginnings: Letters from General Agent Atticus G. Haygood to Rutherford B. Hayes. Edited by Curtis W. Garrison 223

A Canadian View of Parties and Issues on the Eve of the Civil War. Edited by James J. Talman 245

Ulrich Bonnell Phillips: Historian of the South. Fred Landon 364
Southern Designs on Cuba, 1854-1857, and Some European Opinions. Edited by Gavin B. Henderson 371
The Montgomery Address of Stephen A. Douglas. Edited by David R. Barbee and Milledge L. Bonham, Jr. 527
CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION 81
BOOK REVIEWS 102, 254, 386, 553
HISTORICAL NEWS AND NOTICES 123, 275, 411, 573
COMMUNICATION 572
INDEX 587

The JOURNAL of SOUTHERN HISTORY

VOL. V FEBRUARY, 1939 No. 1



Published quarterly by the

SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME V FEBRUARY, 1939 NUMBER 1

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

BOARD OF EDITORS

JOHN D. BARNHART
Louisiana State University

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL
University of Texas

AVERY O. CRAVEN
University of Chicago

WALTER B. POSEY
Birmingham-Southern College

WILLIAM O. LYNCH
Indiana University

PHILIP DAVIDSON
Agnes Scott College

FRANK L. OWSLEY
Vanderbilt University

W. NEIL FRANKLIN
The National Archives

MANAGING EDITOR
WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE
FRED C. COLE, Louisiana State University

GUARANTOR
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Louisiana State University, University, Louisiana.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University, Louisiana, ander the Act of August 24, 1912.

CONTENTS

The Records of Southern History. By Philip M. Hamer 3

Culture Versus Frontier in Tennessee, 1825-1850. By F. Garvin Davenport 18

The People, William Goebel, and the Kentucky Railroads. By Thomas D. Clark 34

New Viewpoints of Southern Reconstruction. By Francis B. Simkins 49

The Fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Historical Association. By Philip Davidson 62

Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer. By Fletcher M. Green 76

Constitution and By-Laws of the Southern Historical Association 81

Notes and Documents

The John Tobler Manuscripts: An Account of German-Swiss Emigrants in South Carolina, 1737. Edited by Charles G. Cordle 83

Cyrus Griffin's Plan of Reconciliation with the American Colonies. Edited by Henry S. Rorer 98

Book Reviews

Craven, *An Introduction to the History of Bermuda,* by Lowell Joseph Ragatz 102

Kegley, *Kegley's Virginia Frontier; the Beginning of the Southwest; the Roanoke of Colonial Days,* by Hayes Baker-Crothers 103

Bodley, *Our First Great West in Revolutionary War, Diplomacy and Politics,* by Thomas Perkins Abernethy 105

Caughey, *McGillivray of the Creeks,* by R. S. Cotterill 106

Brown, *Old Frontiers: The Story of the Cherokee Indians from Earliest Times to the Date of their Removal to the West, 1838,* by W. Neil Franklin ... 107

Carter, *The Territorial Papers of the United States,* VI, by Mack Swearingen .. 108

Stephenson, *Isaac Franklin, Slave Trader and Planter of the Old South,* by Alfred H. Stone 109

Armstrong, *Fanny Kemble: A Passionate Victorian,* by Leota S. Driver 110

Kohlmeier, *The Old Northwest as the Keystone of the Arch of American Federal Union: A Study in Commerce and Politics,* by John D. Barnhart 112

Sydnor, *A Gentleman of the Old Natchez Region: Benjamin L. C. Wailes,* by Herbert A. Kellar 114

Roberts, *Semmes of the Alabama,* by William M. Robinson, Jr. 115

McCordock, *The Yankee Cheese Box,* by H. A. Trexler 117

Siviter, *Recollections of War and Peace, 1861-1868,* by Henry T. Shanks 118

Klingberg, *Old Sherry: Portrait of a Virginia Family,* by C. C. Regier 119

Taylor and McDavid, eds., *Memoirs of Richard Cannon Watts, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of South Carolina, 1927-1930,* by Alester Garden Holmes 120

Hamilton, *A Second Constitution for the United States of America,* by William M. Robinson, Jr. 121

Historical News and Notices 123

Personal 124

Historical Societies 126

Bibliographical 128

Contributors 139

The Records of Southern History

By PHILIP M. HAMER

The preservation and study of the records of Southern history is a problem with which all persons who have a real interest in the South's past and care for its present and its future should be concerned.[1] Such persons are justly proud of much of the South's peculiar heritage and of the notable progress which has been made in building a new South; but they realize that in many respects the South of today falls below their exacting ideal of it, and they hope that they can participate in the creation of a future South in which there will be a maximum of well-being and civilized living for all Southerners. They believe it to be of fundamental importance in the building of this future South that intelligent judgment and will, based upon knowledge and understanding, be applied to the solution of its problems.

To this building of the future South the historian can be an important contributor. He can assist in making known the realities of the past in order that those of the present may be understood and that the future may be wisely planned; he can assist in developing in the South a collective memory and a social consciousness which will contribute to a realistic orientation with the present and to a reasonable foreseeing of the future. For history has no meaning and its study has no purpose unless knowledge of the past makes understandable the present which continuously absorbs the future and quickly becomes itself the past. If this be not so, historians must feel that their professional lives, collectively and individually, are ones of complete frustration. The modern historian, however, looks backward in order that he may look forward,

[1] This paper was read as the presidential address before the Southern Historical Association at New Orleans, Louisiana, November 4, 1938.

and he thereby identifies himself significantly with the society in which he lives.

But the historian can know the past, and can make it known, only to the extent that records of that past have been preserved and can be used by him. What, then, are these records, the materials which the historian needs for his re-creation of the past of that portion of the United States which we call the South? In the broadest sense they are the sum total of those things which, upon examination at any time after they have been made, enable the examiner to re-create the lives of the people who made them, the society of which these people were a part in all of its significant aspects, and, over a period of years extending to the present, trace the development of that complex of human relationships which has produced the present and seek to find some meaning in it.

These records of Southern history are of many kinds. They are such products of man's handiwork as the primitive implements of warfare and of domestic life which the archaeologist unearths from aboriginal mounds and town sites. They are the clothes, the house furnishings, the farm implements, the weapons, and other products of human industry which have been gathered into our museums or ought to be preserved there. They are the results of the creative aspirations of Southern artists. They are photographs of Southern men and women and of places and events—some historic, in the commonly accepted sense of that word, many commonplace, but each depicting in some respect an aspect of Southern life which is, or in the future will be, of value to the student of a broadly conceived history of the South. They are the motion picture films on which is made a visual record of events, and sound recordings which make it possible for future historians to hear the songs we sing, the speeches we make, and the radio programs to which we listen. They are such records as are made of the ballads of the Southern mountaineers, the songs of Negroes in the cotton fields or on the wharves or on the chain gang, and even the swing music of our modern "jitter-bugs."

Among the records of Southern history, by way of further example, are the buildings of the Vieux Carré, with their iron gates and balconies and their secluded patios, and other structures throughout the South

which assist us in our study of the history of Southern architecture or otherwise help us to understand the lives of those who have built and have occupied them. They are restaurants such as Antoine's in which we dine this evening, itself an institution in which history has been made and itself a part of history. They are the printed records of man's thoughts and actions, books, newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, broadsides, etc., the earliest imprints, today's newspaper, and such fugitive items as campaign posters and leaflets. They are such unprinted records as letters, diaries, memoranda, and other documents which record the multiplicity of our activities in the religious, economic, political, and social phases of our life. Important among them are the records created by our national, state, and local governments.

Neither age, nor autograph, nor association with names of distinction or with unique events is the sole measure of value of the records which our historians need. No peculiar sanctity attaches to a document solely because now it is yellow with age, the ink so faded that it can scarcely be read. Its value is to be measured in terms of its informational content. Many of those which were created only yesterday are of greater potential value to the historian than inconsequential scraps of paper which date from earlier centuries. For the historian, a document which bears the signature of George Washington, Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, or even Button Gwinnett is valuable only to the extent that there is information in it which adds to our understanding of the past. Of far more value may be some letter, or diary, or account book bearing the signature of a man who individually was unimportant but who has left a record which significantly throws light on an otherwise unknown or incompletely understood phase of Southern life. Of greater value than accounts of many unique and spectacular events which delight the antiquarian or the episodic historian are plantation diaries, census schedules, court proceedings, case histories of millions on relief, and other records which are individually commonplace for the most part in themselves but can assist greatly in our attempted reconstruction of the past.

In the past, regrettably, we have not been careful to preserve those records which today would enable us to know our history as we should

like to know it. "There hath been a great neglect in keeping the records," was the complaint of Virginia's lawmakers as early as 274 years ago. Such today is the complaint which historians still make. Many of those who have had records in their custody have failed—whatever the reason—adequately to preserve and to make accessible much of our basic source material.

As regards our public records, those made by agencies of government, they have, on the whole, been more carefully preserved than those which can be described as nongovernmental. There have been some legal requirements that they be kept; some of them have administrative value or are basic documents for the establishment of title to property. However wide the gap between legal requirements and actual practice, law and administrative necessity have had some influence making for the preservation of records which would otherwise have been lost. Nevertheless, the record of their destruction is appalling.

In the course of years fire has taken a heavy toll; but reference can here be made only to a few of the major catastrophes caused by fire. In Alabama the state capitol was burned in 1849; and though records on the lower floors were saved, the State Library with its valuable collection of documents was destroyed. In Virginia the capitol was burned in 1676, 1698, and 1748; and in 1865 fire destroyed the state courthouse in Richmond, resulting in the loss of many valuable records including those of the old General Court from about 1619, of the Court of Appeals, and of many county courts which had been brought to Richmond for safekeeping during the war. In Texas in 1855 fire destroyed all the records of the adjutant general's office, and tradition has it "that certain wayward citizens had a lively interest in some of the criminal records in the office which they desired expunged, and that the fire was not accidental." In North Carolina many of the state's early records were lost when the capitol burned in 1831. In South Carolina fire in the statehouse destroyed records in 1788, and in 1865. In Kentucky the capitol was burned in 1813 and 1824, and in 1865 fire in the offices of the governor, the secretary of state, and the clerk of the Court of Appeals created serious gaps in important series of records.

War has twice been a major instrument of destruction of records in the South. Here again a few illustrations must suffice. During the Revolution many of Georgia's records were destroyed by the British and others were lost as they were hurriedly carted to Charleston, South Carolina, then to New Bern, North Carolina, and finally as far as Maryland to keep them from the British. In Virginia, upon the advance of the British, the records at Williamsburg were removed to Richmond and subsequently were tumbled into wagons and carted away to the upper James River country. Many of them had to be collected later from private residences along the route, and many were lost. The Civil War also caused much destruction. Many valuable records were destroyed when state capitols or courthouses were burned or sacked by Union troops; often records were hastily shipped from one place to another in the attempt to protect them from the invading armies with the result that many were never returned. In Jackson, Mississippi, for instance, Union troops destroyed many records of the state and wantonly mutilated others, frequently writing across the pages "Remember Grant," "Remember Sherman," etc. In 1862 Confederate troops, occupying the quarters of the Alabama State Historical Society, used its collection of valuable old newspapers to start their fires. In Arkansas report has it that when paper became scarce some of the state records were used for cartridges.

The major causes, however, of the destruction of the records of our history have been, in addition to fire and war, custodial and public ignorance and negligence and carelessness and indifference. In the old state capitol in Little Rock, Arkansas, the overflow of records from state offices was dumped for decades into "the catacombs" in the basement, the province of the State Library, where the rooms were described as late as 1906 as "damp, dismal, and disagreeable." In Georgia "many valuable, even priceless documents of the state have served on occasion to kindle fires in the capitol." In this state also, it has been said that every change of personnel resulted in a house cleaning in which records not immediately required were thrown away. This statement is substantiated by the fact that a resurvey of the state's archives made fifteen

years after Ulrich B. Phillips' report on the public archives of Georgia revealed that "any number of valuable records" he listed "had entirely disappeared." In Kentucky, when the state offices were moved into the new capitol, great quantities of records were sold as waste paper. Here also in 1900 troops which were quartered in the capitol during the Goebel-Taylor conflict "made their beds of documents and lighted their pipes with leaves from the files." In Virginia, just after the Civil War, practically all extant state records are reported to have been thrown "in a confused heap into one of the garrets of the capitol," from which they were not removed until 1891. In South Carolina, it is said, practically all the records of the adjutant general's office "were destroyed during the World War by an army sergeant who wanted to use the boxes for shipping purposes." In Mississippi inactive state records were consigned to prison; having been accumulated on the third floor of the capitol, "in hopeless confusion," it was feared that the weight of them endangered the lives of the members of the Supreme Court who sat in the room below, so the records were removed to the penitentiary. In Tennessee, as offices in the state capitol became crowded, the inactive records were dumped into a crypt in the basement. Here, one observer reported, they "lay piled in masses on the stone floors, among old paint barrels, ashes, trash of every description, dirt and grime. They were wet and rotting, and . . . the janitor . . . burned up several cartloads because of the fact that they were 'wet and nasty and smelled bad.'" Quantities were sold, without legislative authorization, as waste paper. In Florida, about thirty years ago, an investigator found that some of the records of the office of the secretary of state had recently been recovered from a coal bin and that others in the garret were "loose and in great confusion," many of them lying on the floor so thickly that it was literally covered with them.

One might continue at considerable length to cite specific instances of the destruction or mistreatment of the public records of our states. And it is probable that records of our counties have suffered even more severely from war, fire, neglect, theft, dampness, vermin, dirt, etc., than those of our state governments. The fate of the records of our munici-

palities has been worse, on the whole, than that of our county records. Descriptions of their condition are meager, but it seems fair to assume that the following account, written in 1903, of the records of a former capital of Georgia is characteristic of far too many of them: "They are in no arrangement, and no care is taken of them. Some of them have been damaged by mice, and all of them . . . are exceedingly dusty and disagreeable to use."

As regards nonpublic records, their preservation has been even more fortuitous, more the result of chance and less the result of foresight than the public ones. We have little of the tradition of preserving family archives. Personal papers have been destroyed deliberately, often by descendants who had no conception of their value. Many have been preserved for a time and then destroyed by fire. One is impressed, and disheartened, as he reads, for example, in the reports of the surveys published by the historical commissions of Alabama and Mississippi more than thirty-five years ago that when attempts were made to locate the papers of prominent citizens of those states, frequently it was reported that they had been destroyed by fire or otherwise lost. Too often when they have been preserved, their present possessors are disinclined, for a multitude of reasons, to place them in institutions where they will be kept safely and made available for the use of scholars. Little attempt has been made to preserve business records by the owners thereof. Usually they have been destroyed when they have ceased to be of administrative use; little attention has been paid to this type of record by collecting agencies. Records of our social and religious organizations are indifferently kept and often carelessly misplaced or deliberately thrown away.

The underlying reason for most of the destruction of our official records has been public and legislative indifference and a consequent failure to establish in each state an agency of government with sufficient authority and adequate funds to concern itself solely with the preservation, care, and administration of those records. In all of our states, of course, it has been provided by law that certain records must be kept by certain administrative governmental agencies, but such legislation has been based primarily upon consideration of administrative necessity

rather than upon any consideration of historical needs, and practice has often and regrettably varied widely from the law. It should not be forgotten, of course, that during the nineteenth century there were spasmodic evidences of governmental interest in records from the historical as distinguished from the administrative point of view. More often than not this represented the results of the influence of individuals or of local historical societies upon legislative authorities. Notable, in this connection, was the action of North Carolina in securing transcripts of records in Great Britain for the Colonial period of her history and the publication of them in *The Colonial Records of North Carolina,* the first volume of which came from the press in 1886; and this example has been followed in varying degree by other Southern states.

The early years of the twentieth century, however, saw a decided improvement in the attitude of legislative authorities in a number of states. This appears to have been a result of the efforts of a relatively small number of men who had not only an understanding of the desirability of preserving the records of our history but those combinations of personality characteristics which enabled them to secure legislative action.

Alabama was the first state in the South to establish a state agency, financed by public funds, whose purpose was to preserve and make available for use the state's noncurrent archives, to collect other historical records, and otherwise to promote the study and increased knowledge of the state's history. The man who was almost solely responsible for this was Thomas M. Owen, a young lawyer, untrained in history as such training is known today but interested in history since childhood, intelligent, resourceful, energetic, and enthusiastic, with a vision of a state supported archival and historical agency, and with the ability to make this vision a reality. In 1898 he virtually assumed control of the moribund Alabama Historical Society and gave it new life; he became its secretary and soon secured for it a state appropriation to finance an annual publication. From the legislature he secured also the appointment of an Alabama History Commission, empowered to make a comprehensive survey of the records of Alabama's history "whether in domestic or foreign archives or repositories, or in private hands." As chairman of

this Commission, Owen planned its work and was largely responsible for its report which was submitted in 1900 to the governor and by him to the legislature. The report contained not only the results of an excellent preliminary survey but also a recommendation that a state Department of Archives and History be established. The recommendation was approved by the legislature with the result that in 1901 the department came into existence with Owen as director. Its purposes were declared to be "the care and custody of official archives, the collection of materials bearing upon the history of the State, and the territory included therein, from the earliest times, the compilation and publication of the State's official records and other historical materials, the diffusion of knowledge in reference to the history and resources of the State, the encouragement of historical work and research, and the performance of such other acts and requirements as may be enjoined by law."

Alabama's action had a marked influence upon other states. In Mississippi, in 1900, the legislature provided for the establishment of an Historical Commission similar in purpose to that which Alabama had created two years earlier. With Professor Franklin L. Riley, member of the faculty of the state university and for many years secretary of the Mississippi Historical Society, as its chairman, the Commission issued a report similar in character and recommendations to that of Alabama's Commission. In 1902 the legislature approved a bill which Professor Riley had drafted, providing for the creation of a state Department of Archives and History, and Dunbar Rowland was chosen to be its director. In Arkansas, influenced by the action of Alabama and Mississippi and by the work of Professor J. H. Reynolds of the state university, the legislature provided in 1905 for the appointment of a History Commission to make a survey of the records for the history of the state. With Professor Reynolds as secretary, the Commission completed and published a report similar in character to those of Alabama and Mississippi. In 1909 the legislature provided for a reorganized History Commission, with a secretary as its administrative officer, similar in power and duties to the departments of archives and history in Alabama and Mississippi, but it failed for four years to appropriate money even

for the payment of the secretary's salary, and has never provided adequate financial support.

Meanwhile, in 1905, West Virginia's legislature created its Department of Archives and History, with an historian and archivist in charge; and South Carolina established an Historical Commission, with an administrative secretary, to serve as the archival and historical agency of that state. Two years later North Carolina's legislature took similar action. It enlarged the powers and duties of an Historical Commission which had been established in 1903, making it the archival and historical agency of the state. Mr. R. D. W. Connor became the first secretary of this new Historical Commission, as he had been of the old one, and was largely responsible for making it one of the recognized leaders in state archival and historical work in the United States. Recently the North Carolina legislature has enacted laws which place that state in the forefront of Southern states in archival legislation as well as accomplishment. In Georgia provision was made for the office of Compiler of State Records in 1902, with the result that a number of volumes of valuable documents relating to the Colonial, Revolutionary, and Confederate periods of Georgia's history were published, but it was not until 1918 that a Department of Archives and History was established. Maryland, with its Hall of Records, is the latest addition to the group of states which have separate state agencies in which are combined the functions of an archival establishment and an historical society.

In Virginia, in 1906, a Department of Archives and History was organized as a unit of the State Library. In Tennessee, by the Reorganization Act of 1923, provision was made for a Division of Library and Archives in the Department of Education. Kentucky has a Department of Library and Archives. In Texas responsibility for the preservation of the records of Texas history is vested in both the State Library and the University of Texas, the former in practice giving its chief attention to state archives and the latter, with some notable exceptions, to other types of records. Two years ago the Louisiana legislature made the Archives Department of Louisiana State University the chief archival and historical agency of the state government. In West Virginia an

anomalous situation has been created. With the Department of Archives and History at Charleston continuing in existence, the state legislature in 1934 gave permission to custodians of state and county archives to turn over their records to the Division of Documents of West Virginia University at Morgantown. In Oklahoma the State Historical Society is the archival and historical agency of the state. Florida appears to be the only Southern state which has not, in some degree, followed the example set by Alabama in 1901.

The general pattern, then, of governmental organization for the preservation of the records of Southern history has taken the form of a separate state agency, or a separate unit of a state agency, charged with the triple duty of taking custody of and preserving the noncurrent public records of the state, of collecting for preservation other records of the state's history, and of taking action otherwise to increase and diffuse knowledge of that history. This duty has been met by those agencies in widely varying degrees. Some few have placed themselves among the nation's leaders; some give promise soon of winning such a place; some lag far behind. If adequate support can be secured, all of them could do much more than has yet been done.

More recently than the states, the Federal government has given its attention to the preservation of the records of Southern history. The Library of Congress, particularly through its Division of Manuscripts, has acquired many newspapers, other printed materials, personal papers, and transcripts or film copies from archives and other repositories abroad. The last are particularly valuable for the Colonial period of Southern history. The National Archives is taking custody of great quantities of the records of the Federal government, among them much of outstanding value for the history of the South, and is making them conveniently available for consultation by students. Within the past few weeks, for example, such of the archives of the Confederate States of America as were in the possession of the department of war, formerly stored in a garage in Washington, have been brought into the Archives Building. The National Park Service of the department of the interior is preserving many historic sites in the South. The Public Works Administration

has helped construct many buildings in the South in which records will be more safely and more conveniently housed than heretofore. Notable among these are buildings to be occupied by the Alabama Department of Archives and History in Montgomery and the North Carolina Historical Commission in Raleigh. The Works Progress Administration, as a part of its relief program, has spent millions of dollars on work which is of great importance for all persons who are interested in the history of the South. Its Survey of Federal Archives has inventoried practically all of the records of the Federal government now in the Southern states and these inventories are being published in mimeograph form. Its Historic American Buildings Survey has made measured drawings and photographs of hundreds of the South's most historic buildings, and gathered information for a comprehensive history of architecture in the South. Most important of all, its Historical Records Survey is engaged upon an ambitious program which includes the inventorying of state, county, municipal, and church archives and institutional and private collections of manuscripts, the compilation of catalogs of early imprints, and the calendaring and indexing of documents, etc., in all the Southern states. Much of the results of its work has been or will be published. Many local projects of the Works Progress Administration have rendered assistance of various kinds to those who have records of Southern history in their custody.

In addition to what the state and Federal governments have done, much valuable work has been accomplished by nongovernmental agencies. In an earlier period local historical societies, often dominated by some one man or a small group of men, preserved records which otherwise would have been destroyed, or built up valuable collections only to have them destroyed. Individuals with the collector's instinct or with plans for the writing of local histories made their collections. Of recent years some universities have had marked success in developing collections of manuscripts, newspapers, pamphlets, books, etc., in the field of Southern history. Notable among these are the University of Texas, the University of North Carolina, Duke University, Louisiana State University, the University of Virginia, and West Virginia University.

Many other institutions have done similar work in their special fields of interest.

In spite of the fact that much has been done to preserve the records of the history of the South and that notable progress has been made in many respects in most recent years, there is much more that needs to be done if we would make available the records needed by the present generation for its study of the past and provide for future generations those records of our own which they will need when they come to study us in historical perspective. One of our major needs is that there be in each state a unit of the state government whose sole concern shall be the preservation of the official records in the state, the systematic collection and preservation of other records relating to the state's history, the making of them conveniently accessible for consultation, the furnishing of information from them, the execution of a carefully formulated plan of publication, and the dissemination otherwise of information regarding the state's history to its citizens and others. This historical commission or department of archives and history—its name is of no importance—should be professional in its administration and in its personnel. The director or secretary should be appointed for a long term of office on the basis of professional qualifications and not because of political affiliations or for sentimental reasons. It should normally be expected that he have a doctoral degree in history from a reputable university or the equivalent of such a degree, some training in or study of archival science, and that he also have those qualities of personality which are obviously necessary for the successful occupancy of such a position. Such an agency for the preservation of historical records might well be closely associated with the state university as is the case now in Louisiana, or with some other educational institution, when circumstances make such an arrangement desirable.

To such an agency, if its professional character can be assured, should be given greater authority than has yet been given to any of our existing agencies. It should have power to inspect all public records, state, county, and municipal, to prescribe regulations for their safekeeping, and to compel obedience to these regulations. It should have author-

ity to transfer to its custody all noncurrent records which it deems worthy of preservation. It should be the agency for recommending to the legislative authorities which records should be destroyed, upon the request of the agency concerned, and no destruction without such action should be permitted. It should undertake systematically to collect for its state such records as have previously been referred to in this address as the records of Southern history. It should classify, catalog, calendar, and otherwise facilitate the use of the voluminous records which it would accumulate. It should undertake a program of publication even more extensive than, for example, that at one time engaged in by the Mississippi Department of Archives and History or that consistently followed by the North Carolina Historical Commission.

Such an agency should of course be given adequate financial support, or, whatever the powers and duties vested in it by law, it will be as ineffectual in meeting present-day and future problems as some of our state agencies now are. It must have an adequate building, not only fireproof and provided with modern devices for the preservation of records, but spacious enough to house the accumulations of valuable records which sometimes seem to be on the point of overwhelming us. It must have money for equipment, for publication, and for a professionally trained and sufficiently numerous staff. Too often our failures in the past have resulted in large part because of inadequate financial support. There is much wisdom in the comment of a former president of this Association, "Though poverty may not curb the imagination, it stifles action."

Above all else we need an awakened public interest in the problems of preserving the records of our history. The existence of the Southern Historical Association is both evidence of the existence of an interest in our history and a means of increasing that interest. We need in each state to have active societies with similar purposes, and in our smaller units of government local societies concerned with the history of those localities and the records thereof. What has been done in the past has been done in a hit-and-miss fashion. What records we have now are in considerable

part the result of chance. What we should do now is to plan, under competent professional leadership, to preserve the records of our Southern history in the future and to make use of them for an increasing knowledge of that history and thereby an increasingly comprehensive understanding of that particular part of the United States in which we live.

Culture Versus Frontier in Tennessee 1825-1850

By F. GARVIN DAVENPORT

The intellectual life of Tennessee from 1825 to 1850 revolved around the person of Philip Lindsley who became president of Cumberland College (later the University of Nashville) in 1824. The career of this pioneer educator, with its disappointments and disillusionments, may be taken as typical of all intellectual leaders who attempted to carry enlightenment and culture from the East to the West.

Philip Lindsley (1786-1855), the son of Isaac and Phoebe Lindsley, was born near Morristown, New Jersey. He received most of his primary education at home, although he was in sporadic attendance at boarding and grammar schools. In 1799 he entered Robert Finley's new academy at Basking Ridge, New Jersey. This academy became known as one of the best in the country and it is evident that Finley made a deep and lasting impression on Lindsley, who regarded him in later years as a model educator.[1]

Lindsley left Finley's school in 1802 and entered the College of New Jersey (later Princeton) as a junior and graduated with the bachelor of arts degree in 1804. After various teaching experiences he returned to Princeton in 1807 and received the master of arts degree in September of that year. The president of the college, Samuel Stanhope Smith, who admired Lindsley, persuaded him to remain to tutor in Greek and Latin and to study theology. For the next seventeen years he was closely as-

[1] L. J. Halsey (ed.), *The Works of Philip Lindsley, D.D.*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1866), I, 11-18; III, 10-27; W. B. Sprague (ed.), *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 5 vols. (New York, 1858), IV, 465. Robert Finley (1772-1817) was a Presbyterian clergyman and the organizer of the American Colonization Society.

sociated with Princeton.[2] The period of his residence, from his acceptance of the tutorship in 1807 to his resignation and removal to Nashville in 1824, was important in relation to his subsequent career as an educator. In 1810 he was licensed to preach by the presbytery of New Brunswick, New Jersey. In 1812 he was promoted to a senior tutorship at Princeton and the next year he became professor of languages. He was also college librarian during most of this seventeen-year period, a position for which he was well suited because of his love for books. In 1817 he was ordained by the presbytery of New Brunswick and in the same year he was elected vice-president of the college. From 1822 to 1823 he was acting president and could have been president had he so desired. This honor, however, he declined, as he did similar offers from Transylvania University, Ohio University, and at first, Cumberland College.[3]

Why did he finally yield to the importunities of the Nashville school? Probably because he saw possibilities in the Southwest which were not disclosed to less farsighted men; probably, too, because the educational needs of the new region challenged his ambitions and his ingenuity. Be that as it may, Lindsley visited Nashville in 1824, and when he returned to Princeton he had made his decision. He was ready to cast his lot with the struggling institution beyond the Alleghenies.

It was the day before Christmas, 1824, that Lindsley and his family arrived in Nashville. There was a sharp contrast between this immature village on the Cumberland and the Eastern environment to which the Lindsleys were accustomed. Even so, in spite of its primitive aspects, the town must have appeared as a veritable oasis to the weary travelers after the tortuous journey over the mountains. Exactly how Lindsley reacted to this new environment is difficult to tell. Being a newcomer, he was diplomatic enough to refrain from stating openly his opinions. However, within a few years he published in the Nashville papers anonymous essays which, it would seem, reflected in an exaggerated and humorous manner the true thoughts in his mind.

Over the pseudonym, "An Old Field Pedagogue," Lindsley declared

[2] Sprague (ed.), *Annals of the American Pulpit,* IV, 465-66.
[3] Halsey (ed.), *Works of Philip Lindsley,* I, 12-13.

that nothing in Tennessee ever reached perfection. There were no good fruits or garden vegetables and quality meat was scarce. The same was true of fish, butter, cheese, and pumpkin pies. In general there was "nothing but cotton, tobacco, corn, whiskey, Negroes and swine, and these not worth the growing."[4] Obviously, Lindsley was not too well pleased with Tennessee food products. Continuing in this satirical mood, he wrote: "Everything degenerates in Tennessee. Doctors are made by guess . . . lawyers by magic . . . parsons by inspiration . . . legislators by grog . . . merchants by Mammon . . . farmers by necessity . . . editors and schoolmasters by St. Nicholas."[5]

Lindsley found the population of Nashville and Tennessee mobile and restless. This was characteristic of frontier and semifrontier regions, and Tennessee was no exception. Nashville was subjected, more or less willingly, to the charlatanry and knavery of migratory entertainers. Jugglers, animal trainers, ropewalkers, fiddlers, fire-eaters, lecturers, to say nothing of panaceists of all types, visited the river towns, fooled the people, and with what cash they were able to obtain left in a hurry by the first boat.[6]

Beggars, false and bona fide, were seen frequently on the streets of Nashville and it was not unusual for them to stop at the homes of the well-to-do citizens to ask for work or to beg for alms. The false beggars were the greatest nuisance. These men posed as alienated or orphaned Turks, Russians, Germans, Italians, or Spaniards, and they carried duly certified papers telling their tales of woe. Within a period of three years Lindsley was visited by 259 "shipwrecked Germans, Spaniards, and Portuguese" and other beggars of all sorts.[7] These characters indicated by signs that they could not speak English and invariably presented forged credentials in English which spoke and lied for them. Some beggars were content to be American citizens, especially if they had fought in the War of 1812 or in some Indian uprising. Lindsley was impressed by

[4] *Ibid.*, III, 629.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *Ibid.*, 630; *National Banner and Nashville Whig*, May 25, 1831; *National Banner and Nashville Daily Advertiser*, May 7, 1833.

[7] Halsey (ed.), *Works of Philip Lindsley*, III, 611.

two crippled soldiers who paid him a visit. According to their story, they had fought with Jackson at New Orleans and "had been dying ever since."[8]

Lindsley thought that some of the habits of Tennessee gentlemen were as crude as those of beggars. The common practice of spitting tobacco juice over the floor was offensive to him. He declared that "the habit of spitting acquired and rendered unavoidable by the practice of chewing tobacco is so offensive to all well-bred people as to exact some surprise that *gentlemen* should continue it."[9] Tennessee tobacco-chewing enthusiasts were as apt to spit on the floor of the church as on the floor of a saloon. Lindsley himself had some unfortunate experiences with tobacco juice during church services that "put all devotion out of countenance."[10]

In 1825 Nashville, the new home of the Lindsleys, was still a backwoods town and yet it was able to boast of certain appurtenances of civilization. A reading room was open to accommodate "the newsmonger, lounger, and stranger" as well as those few citizens who were studiously inclined. This establishment was maintained by subscription and contained many of the principal American newspapers and a few copies of popular literary works.[11]

Even at this early date the medical profession was quite well represented but doubtless some of the so-called "physicians" were merely quacks. Dentists, too, were practicing their trade.[12] In March, 1825, five Nashville physicians were appointed by the Mayor and Board of Aldermen to constitute a board of health.[13] This body had no real authority, no definite aims, and apparently accomplished nothing.[14] However, it was a step in the right direction although Nashville was destined to wait until after the Civil War for its first permanently organized board of sanitation.

[8] *Ibid.*, 612.
[9] *Ibid.*, 623.
[10] *Ibid.*, 624.
[11] Nashville *Whig*, February 28, May 14, 1825.
[12] *National Banner and Nashville Daily Advertiser*, January 3, 1833, *et seq.*; *National Banner and Nashville Whig*, February 3, 1829.
[13] Nashville *Whig*, March 12, 1825.
[14] *National Banner and Nashville Daily Advertiser*, April 8, 1833.

As early as 1826, Nashville had a museum of "natural and artificial curiosities."[15] The fine arts, too, were represented in a pale sort of way by traveling artists who exhibited oil paintings in hastily improvised studios.[16] Most surprising of all was the interest shown in the drama which had been introduced to Nashville before 1820.[17] In 1826 a new theater, incidentally the town's third since 1819, was erected at a cost of $20,000.[18] Such an institution seems almost incongruous, but Nashville was a town of strange contrasts. If at first thought oil paintings, museums of natural history, and grease paint seem anachronous in a town still partly composed of log cabins, it must be remembered that Nashville was the most important town in Tennessee, and hence a logical place for speculators and promoters of all types to exercise their genius. Furthermore, many of the citizens were doubtless half starved for entertainment, and they turned to the theater as a happy escape from the drabness of life in a rural town. The crassness of the histrionics and the discomfort of the auditoriums did not daunt these pleasure seekers.

In 1825 Tennessee did not have a public school system and even in Nashville there was none for another quarter of a century. However, there were various private schools and no doubt the best of these was the Nashville Female Academy. In the realms of higher education, Cumberland College was Nashville's bid for fame. When Lindsley became president in 1824, the institution was already eighteen years old but had made little headway against the evils of frontier ignorance and prejudice. Lindsley's education, experience, and ambitions fitted him for the difficult task of building a university although he was to find the task in Tennessee much more difficult than he expected.

It was typical of Lindsley that from the very beginning of his presidency of Cumberland College he set his aims and his ambitions on the highest plane, although he realized that he might never live to see his plans become actualities. "Let us aim at perfection," he said, and this

[15] Nashville *Whig and Banner,* June 22, 1826.

[16] Nashville *Whig,* July 16, August 13, 1825.

[17] Douglas L. Hunt, "The Nashville Theatre, 1830-1840," in Birmingham-Southern College *Bulletin* (Birmingham), XXVIII (1935), No. 3, pp. 3-8.

[18] *Ibid.,* 13; *National Banner and Nashville Whig,* October 11, 1826.

became his motto.[19] In his inaugural address in 1825 and in subsequent lectures, he made public his plans for what he termed "The grand experiment." He wished to build a university that would rank with the best educational institutions of Europe. His enthusiasm inspired the state legislature, on November 27, 1826, to incorporate the officers and trustees of Cumberland College as the University of Nashville.[20] Thus Lindsley's visionary institution became at least a legal actuality, and on January 2, 1829, the *National Banner and Nashville Whig* was able to announce that "the cause of learning has advanced amongst us . . . with a steady, if not accelerated pace."

As a matter of fact, the University of Nashville was struggling against odds and the main obstacles to success were associated with what may be termed the frontier tradition. Any thesis that maintains that Tennessee was always on a high cultural plane because of the intellectual qualities possessed by some of the pioneer leaders completely ignores the fact that these leaders were soon swamped by the wave of ignorance that followed them. A certain amount of intelligence and initiative was necessary to blaze the trails, lay out the towns, and build the foundations of government, but no special ability or training was necessary to follow a trail that was wide open and peculiarly alluring. Consequently the leaders were followed by the common herd which included shyster lawyers, fake preachers, ignorant farmers, and fugitives from justice. In Tennessee this element constituted a bulwark against enlightenment and was the cause of lamentation on the part of Lindsley and a few other public men who possessed both the background and instincts of cultured gentlemen.

In 1830 John Bell, prominent Nashville lawyer, found "the rude and fearful spectre of arts unduly prized, learning generally unappreciated, and every effort to create a thirst for science and a taste for general improvement paralyzed by the cold indifference of the better informed and by popular jealousy and suspicion."[21] According to Bell, the best farmers of Tennessee, while living in plenty, had no desire for the ad-

[19] Halsey (ed.), *Works of Philip Lindsley*, I, 106.

[20] Tennessee *Acts of a Local or Private Nature*, 1826, pp. 45-46.

[21] John Bell, *An Address Delivered at Nashville, October 5, 1830, Being the First Anniversary of the Alumni Society of the University of Nashville* (Nashville, 1830), 4.

vantages of cultivated society. The same was true, he declared, with respect to merchants, physicians, lawyers, and clergymen, "except such individuals of these respective classes as have been graciously supplied from the intellectual redundancy of our sister states."[22] And those graciously supplied were in the minority, if not actually scarce. Bell realized that the minds of a frontier or semifrontier people were "in a forest state," and that it was necessary to clear away physical and mental encumbrances before a mature society could develop. He believed that Nashville in 1830 had passed this incipient stage, and that its citizens should take more interest in cultural and intellectual affairs.[23]

Of the same opinion was William G. Hunt, another Nashville lawyer of the better type. In an address to the literary societies of the University of Nashville in 1831, he declared: "Whatever might be admitted of the inaptitude of an infant settlement in the wilderness for letters and the arts, the time has surely arrived in this community when such an apology for neglecting learning can no longer be offered with plausibility or propriety."[24] Both Bell and Hunt realized that Nashville lacked the finer elements of civilization; both declared that the frontier status had been the initial cause of the condition. But they underestimated the strength of the frontier forces still at work, and consequently the rapid cultural development which they desired was an impossibility.

Even as late as the thirties and forties there were Tennesseans who possessed an aversion for education and cultural life that was almost fanatical. John Caldwell, one of the early promoters of the Ducktown copper mines, told the people of the community that as soon as the mines were opened their condition would be improved "and that civilization, intelligence, comfort, and wealth would be the inevitable results." Whereupon one of the members of the crowd arose and informed Caldwell that a large portion of the inhabitants of the region had come there to get away from civilization, and if it followed them they would leave the country.[25]

[22] *Ibid.*, 5.
[23] *Ibid.*, 6.
[24] *National Banner and Nashville Whig*, April 22, 1831.
[25] James M. Safford, *A Geological Reconnoissance of the State of Tennessee* (Nashville, 1855), 61.

In order to understand the antieducational forces at work in Tennessee it is necessary to examine first of all the problem of the public lands. When the state was authorized in 1806 to appropriate the vacant lands within its boundary, the Federal government decreed that 100,000 acres should be set aside for the support of two colleges, one to be located in East Tennessee and one in West Tennessee. Congress stipulated these lands to be sold for not less than $2.00 per acre, thus creating an endowment of $100,000 for each college. Unfortunately, when the legislature proceeded to execute these provisions, it was discovered that the only land on which the college claims could be located was a large tract south of the French Broad and Holston rivers. This tract was occupied by farmers to whom the state government had promised land titles at the rate of $1.00 per acre. Obviously, at the outset the potential educational fund was cut in half.[26]

This was only the beginning of the difficulty. The settlers of the region were viewed in the light of pioneer heroes and consequently no persistent effort was made to collect the money that they owed the state government, part of which would have been used to endow the University of Nashville. Every attempt on the part of the state to collect the debt was frustrated by a powerful minority. Of course, this minority group represented the semifrontier farmers who occupied the land in question and it was natural for them to foster the interests of their constituents. Bell maintained that the farmers, many of whom were illiterate, jumped at the conclusion that the colleges were trying to force the money from them and perhaps oust them from their land.[27]

Farmers throughout the state sympathized with those on the college grant lands and gave them moral support. Thus there grew up a widespread and bitter feeling of opposition towards all institutions of learning. This prejudice, once formed, became deep-rooted and difficult to eradicate. Because of it Lindsley feared for the future of the farmers. He believed that because of their ignorance and because they denied

[26] Bell, *An Address Delivered at Nashville, October 5, 1830*, p. 8; *Annals of Congress*, 9 Cong., 1 Sess., XV, Appendix, 1262-65 (April 18, 1806).

[27] Bell, *An Address Delivered at Nashville, October 5, 1830*, p. 8.

their children an education, they would gradually sink into comparative insignificance. "Were it in my power," he stated, "I would visit every farmer in Tennessee who is not already awake, and endeavor to arouse him from his fatal lethargy . . . and urge him to reclaim his abandoned rights and his lost dignity by giving to his sons that measure of instruction which will qualify them to assert and to maintain their just superiority in the councils of the State and of the Nation. . . . Educate your son in the best manner possible, because you expect him to be a *man* and not a *horse* or an *ox*."[28]

But the rural people, and the townspeople too, clung to misconceptions which tended to thwart Lindsley's plans to diffuse knowledge throughout the state. There was an idea prevalent in the minds of Tennesseans that colleges and universities were beneficial only to the rich. This was a typical frontier attitude, intensified in Tennessee because of the difficulties which had occurred among the poor farmers, the universities, and the state legislature. Year after year Lindsley attempted to batter down this prejudice. It was absurd, he thought, to deprecate and to denounce colleges as being hostile to the interests of the poor and beneficial only to the wealthy. He maintained that the affluent made sacrifices in order to build, endow, and maintain these institutions and that the poor reaped the principal advantage.[29]

In both urban and rural districts, Lindsley found himself face to face with frontier egotism and the frontier attitude of self-sufficiency. Of what use was education to people who had wrested an empire from the wilderness? Lindsley attempted to point out to them their inferiority in every field of education. He warned them that vanity and incessant boasting was not the way to progress and enlightenment. Continuing on this subject, he asserted: "While we cherish this arrogant, supercilious, overweening, self-sufficient spirit, we shall never seek nor desire improvement, because we fancy that the very acme of human excellence has been attained."[30]

[28] Halsey (ed.), *Works of Philip Lindsley*, I, 225-26.
[29] *Ibid.*, 231.
[30] *Ibid.*, 243-44.

One of the most powerful anticultural forces that tended to keep alive the self-sufficient spirit was frontier religion. To 1840 the three important denominations in Tennessee were the Presbyterians, the Methodists, and the Baptists, and only the first, which was also the weakest, can be considered as a cultural force. Unlike its two powerful rivals, the Presbyterian church insisted on an educated clergy and looked with special favor on a man with several college degrees. It is not surprising to discover that the first group of college trained men on the frontier were Presbyterians, and in Tennessee Philip Lindsley became the most influential. Even the Great Revival, probably the most important movement in the American churches in the nineteenth century, was started by a Presbyterian, James McGready.[31]

The Presbyterians, however, although first on the scene in the frontier regions, were unable to maintain a paramount position as the frontier civilization expanded and matured. This was due to several causes to be found within the denomination itself. In the first place, each minister was allowed only two, or at the most three congregations. Consequently, Presbyterian cultural influence was generally localized. Secondly, the inelastic Calvinistic doctrine came into conflict with frontier philosophy, a factor which enabled the Methodists, Baptists, and later the Christians (Disciples), with their loose organization and more informal creeds, to claim most of the converts. Finally, the Presbyterian church, in an attempt to adjust itself to frontier conditions during the years 1800-1840, was weakened by internal controversy. Thus the Presbyterians, champions of education, were greatly handicapped and in a certain sense became a victim of their own intellectuality. In 1833 there were only sixty-eight Presbyterian ministers in Tennessee or about one to ten thousand inhabitants.[32]

[31] William W. Sweet, *Religion on the American Frontier,* II, *The Presbyterians, 1783-1840* (New York, 1936), 69 ff.; Donald G. Tewksbury, *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities before the Civil War* (New York, 1932), 91-103; T. C. Anderson, *Life of Rev. George Donnell, First Pastor of the Church in Lebanon; with a Sketch of the Scotch-Irish Race* (Nashville, 1858), 152 ff.

[32] Extracts from a letter from Absalom Peters to Benjamin H. Rice, Florence, Alabama, February 28, 1833, in Sweet, *Religion on the American Frontier,* II, 679. Peters and Rice were secretaries of the American Home Mission Society. See, also, *ibid.,* 69 ff., 82 ff. It should be noted that Tewksbury, in his interesting study, *Founding of American Colleges*

Lindsley attempted to maintain a nonsectarian university in Nashville but the people were not likely to forget in this age of religious sensitiveness that he was a Presbyterian with degrees from an Eastern college and hence out of sympathy with the frontier mind. He represented a minority group that was for the most part out of favor. The majority of the people in Tennessee were either Baptists or Methodists and so for sectarian reasons alone, it was inevitable that a certain amount of suspicion should hover over the head of the President of the University of Nashville.

However, in this connection, sectarianism can be considered only as a minor cause. The major force was to be found in the antieducational teachings of the Baptists and Methodists. The latter were not interested in education and frequently showed actual hostility towards it. The preacher who shouted the loudest, gossiped the most, and kissed the greatest number of babies was more popular than the minister with a college degree and a trunk full of polished sermons. It was claimed that when sinners were falling into hell every day, something more potent than collegiate finesse was needed to counteract the evil influence of Satan. In 1846 a Presbyterian missionary, writing from Arkansas, declared that most of the Methodists were "deplorably ignorant, bitterly sectarian, and wildly fanatical." This description could be applied to Tennessee and Kentucky Methodists without changing a word, although by 1850 they were becoming less fanatical in the two older states.[33]

The greatest factor in the rapid growth of Methodism in Tennessee was the itinerant system. The Methodists did not wait for the people to come to their churches. They took their religion on tour and preached the gospel at every village and crossroads. Frequently a single Methodist preacher traveled a circuit with twenty to twenty-five ports of call which might range from a frontier shack to the state legislature. With

and Universities before the Civil War, 102, states that the schisms caused by frontier forces "were not allowed to interfere appreciably with the church program of higher education." He admits, however, that frontier conditions prevented liberal support for colleges in the West and South. *Ibid.,* 24.

[33] C. Washburn to Rev. Messrs. Badger and Hall, Benton County, Arkansas, September 8, 1846, in Sweet, *Religion on the American Frontier,* II, 695 ff., especially 697. See, also, *ibid.,* 221-22.

such a system it is little wonder that they outdistanced their better educated Presbyterian rivals. The latter, with more permanent parishes, were able to make local cultural contributions, but the communities influenced in this way were few compared to those under the thumb of the more virulent Methodist itinerant.[34]

If anything the Baptists were more ignorant and more hostile to education than the Methodists. A. H. Newman, in his study of Baptist churches in the United States,[35] sets forth the idea that this prejudice against education and especially against an educated clergy can be traced back to colonial days when they were forced to support through taxation impious clergymen who had nothing to recommend them except their college degrees. Undoubtedly this was an important factor but it does not rule out of the picture Baptist teachings and frontier influences.

In Tennessee, the greatest religious obstacle to education was a denomination called the Antimission Baptists. They were opposed to academic and theological education and to all societies and organizations working for the spiritual and social welfare of man. Members of this sect believed that preachers were called to the ministry by divine revelations and that any attempt on the part of the preacher to educate himself was sinful. It was their belief, too, that the divine spirit chose the text for the preacher and caused him to deliver the sermon based upon it. To study a subject or make any preparation before delivering a sermon was an insult to God's intelligence and was considered heretical. Everything was left to God. He would redeem His elect in due time and any attempt to assist Him by means of educational or missionary organizations was presumptuous if not blasphemous. In 1846 there were 10,186 Antimission Baptists in Tennessee. Only one other state, Georgia, had a larger number. Kentucky ranked third. This is an indication that as late as the forties the frontier influence was still strong in

[34] A good idea of the duties of a Tennessee itinerant preacher can be obtained by a study of an autobiographical work, *The Life and Times of the Rev. Carroll C. Mayhew* (Nashville, 1857). See, also, F. D. Srygley, *Seventy Years in Dixie* (Nashville, 1891), 176-97; Sweet, *Religion on the American Frontier,* II, 69-70; *id., Methodism in American History* (New York, 1933), 221-22.

[35] A. H. Newman, *History of the Baptist Churches in the United States* (New York, 1915), 336.

these states because, as Sweet remarks, the Antimission Baptists were "strongest where educational facilities were lacking and where the people were out of touch with the usual cultural influences."[36]

It seems that Lindsley was attempting to build a university in the face of opposition variously manifested. Nashville was indeed becoming a cultural oasis but the city was not representative of the entire state. If religious activities may be taken as a criterion, there are indications that the intellectual life of certain rural regions was close to the frontier level throughout the period. Many of the people and many of the preachers knew of only one book and that was the Bible, and all they knew about the Bible was that it was supposed to contain texts for sermons.[37] Many texts, however, never came from the scriptures and frequently sermons were based on popular axioms such as "A stitch in time save nine," or "Every tub shall stand on its own bottom."[38]

It was not uncommon for country preachers to gamble and drink hard liquor. Occasionally they took "indelicate liberties" with the young women in their congregations.[39] Drinking was as common as eating. Srygley reports in his humorous style that "no man could maintain a good character as a church member without keeping constantly on hand enough spirits to stimulate the parson on his monthly visits."[40] In 1834 in Kingston, Tennessee, the Baptists were operating a profitable whiskey distillery. They were opposed to temperance societies and claimed that such organizations were contrary to American liberty and if not checked would eventually destroy both church and state. The Baptists in the same region believed that Sunday schools and Bible societies were responsible for the cholera epidemics![41]

Any study of the anticultural forces in Tennessee before 1850 would be incomplete without a consideration of the influence of Daniel Parker

[36] Sweet, *Religion on the American Frontier,* I, 66-67, 66 n.; Srygley, *Seventy Years in Dixie,* 191-99.

[37] Srygley, *Seventy Years in Dixie,* 191-99.

[38] *Ibid.*

[39] See records of various cases listed in the index under "Discipline," in Sweet, *Religion on the American Frontier,* I, II.

[40] Srygley, *Seventy Years in Dixie,* 176.

[41] Thomas Brown to Rev. A. Peters, Kingston, Tennessee, September 16, 1834, in Sweet, *Religion on the American Frontier,* II, 682.

and Alexander Campbell. Parker was born in Culpeper County, Virginia, and spent his childhood in Georgia. He was brought up in poverty with little education but, being a Baptist, this was not a handicap. In 1803 he was preaching in Dixon County, Tennessee, and from 1806 to 1817 he was living in Sumner County close to the Kentucky line and preaching in both states. In his own words, Parker was "a man of war" and he spent considerable time fighting doctrinal battles with the Methodists. His forceful opposition to benevolent societies, missions, theological schools, and education in general made a deep impression on a number of Tennesseans.[42]

Alexander Campbell (1788-1866) exercised a wider influence. From 1813 to 1830 he was a Baptist and through the columns of his paper, the *Christian Baptist,* he carried on a merciless campaign against an educated clergy and all cultural organizations for which he could not find scriptural authority. By nature Campbell was a controversialist and he has been described as "one born to command."[43] His words carried weight as far as his paper circulated and it found its way into homes throughout the West and South.[44]

In an open letter to the students of Hamilton Seminary, New York, Campbell declared that the *Christian Baptist* "never has looked with a benign aspect either upon the professors of theological schools, nor their disciples."[45] He expressed the same opinion in an editorial that ridiculed the *Boston Recorder* for its interest in the American Education Society and the campaign in the East to produce better educated ministers. "The scheme of a learned priesthood chiefly composed of beneficiaries," he wrote, "has long since proved itself to be a grand desire to keep men in ignorance and bondage."[46] Campbell believed the values attributed to education were exaggerated, especially when applied to the ministry. He was stubborn in his belief that the Bible needed no explanation by

[42] J. H. Spencer, *A History of Kentucky Baptists from 1769 to 1885,* 2 vols. (Cincinnati, 1885), I, 575.

[43] *American Christian Review* (Cincinnati, 1856-1857), I (1856), 381.

[44] In 1827 the Nashville agent for the *Christian Baptist* was Moses Norvell. *Christian Baptist* (Bethany, 1823-1829), IV (1827), 216.

[45] *Ibid.,* II (issue of November, 1826, in second edition, 1827), 84-89.

[46] *Ibid.,* I (issue of September, 1823, in second edition, 1827), 45-47.

lectures, expositions, commentaries, annotations, or books of any kind. The divine spirit was responsible for the Bible, and for man to attempt to explain the scriptures was sacrilegious as no man was justified in questioning God's intelligence.[47] A correspondent of the *Christian Baptist* gave a final touch to Campbell's ideas on education when he wrote, "the generality of mankind can never, in any possible circumstances, have leisure or capacity for learning or profound contemplation."[48] This was a pessimistic extension of Campbell's theory to apply to all mankind.

The similarity between the ideas expressed in the columns of the *Christian Baptist* and the attitudes exhibited by the laymen and preachers in Tennessee is significant. Of course, there is no way of measuring accurately the influence of the paper as a negative force in the development of Western and Southern education and care should be taken not to overemphasize its importance. At the same time there are certain salient facts that deserve careful consideration. The *Baptist* had a wide circulation, Campbell was a recognized leader, and he expressed vehement opposition to clerical education. It is difficult to determine whether or not he was opposed to general education for the laymen, but his ideas could be easily interpreted to include all educational institutions and they were probably utilized in this manner to give authoritative support to prejudices nurtured by the frontier mind.

It is significant, too, that Tennessee and Nashville had a closer contact with the divine of Bethany than that afforded by his religious journal. He visited Nashville in 1826 and again in 1830. In 1826 he spent several weeks in the capital city and preached to large audiences, and in 1830 he was given a warm reception by the crowds that turned out to hear him. During his second visit he was inveigled into a controversy with Obadiah Jennings, the pastor of the Nashville Presbyterian Church. Here was a debate between the disciple of higher education and the agent of the anticultural forces, who was an experienced and expert disputant. In spite of the fact that the Presbyterians claimed the victory, Campbell seems to have maintained his position unshaken, a fact which

[47] Alexander Campbell, "On teaching Christianity, no. III," *ibid.*, I (issue of January, 1824, in second edition, 1827), 104-109.

[48] Dr. Beatties' letter, *ibid.*, I (issue of August, 1823, in second edition, 1827), 25.

increased his influence in Tennessee and which caused Lindsley's influence to decrease, at least temporarily. About a decade later Campbell revised his views but this change of attitude had little effect upon the history of education in Tennessee during the period under review.[49]

The influence of the frontier mind as a negative force in Tennessee's social and cultural development was indeed potent. After ten years of persistent labor, Lindsley realized that he had expected too much of the people of his adopted state. He had aimed at perfection, but in 1837 he had secured only "an element—a mere atom—a foundation—a nucleus—a corner stone—a first essay towards the glorious consummation and perfection of my own cherished hopes and anticipations."[50] But it was in laying the foundation of the University of Nashville that Lindsley made his contribution. Although the institution fell short of his ambitions, and toward the close of his presidency was described as having a "worm eaten appearance,"[51] nevertheless it became the cornerstone of the educational prominence of Nashville. He was a missionary of both common school and higher education and the increase in the number of educational institutions of all types in Tennessee during his presidency was due in no small degree to his influence. True, many of these schools had a mushroom growth, and their scholastic standards were low; all of them were less able to cope with the inevitable obstacles than the University of Nashville. At any rate, they were indicative of an awakening, however elemental it may have been.

Before the Civil War there was not enough time for social and cultural processes to develop to fruition except in certain urban localities such as Davidson County. After 1850 Nashville became an important cultural center with well-organized schools and colleges. In view of the background, it is surprising that the city contributed as much as it did before secession disrupted its natural development. The fact that Nashville and a few other communities had risen far above the frontier level of society by 1850 speaks well for the few indefatigable representatives of culture among whom Philip Lindsley may be considered a leader.

[49] *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell* (Cincinnati, 1870), 168, 338 ff., 524 n.
[50] Halsey (ed.), *Works of Philip Lindsley*, I, 399.
[51] Nashville *Daily Union*, October 19, 1849.

The People, William Goebel, and the Kentucky Railroads

By THOMAS D. CLARK

There stands before the Kentucky state capitol an upright statue of William Goebel. Inscribed upon the base of this statue are what is said to be the last mortal words of this "self-appointed" friend of the people: "Tell my friends to be brave and fearless and loyal to the great common people." These words came from the lips of the northern Kentucky politician just before 6:40 p.m., February 3, 1900, when the hand of death was tightening its fatal grip.[1] Five days before, William Goebel, Jack Chinn, and Eph Lillard were hurriedly approaching the capitol office building; Lillard, a fast walker, was ahead; Goebel had slackened his pace to allow the stocky and winded Chinn to catch up. When Chinn was within a couple of paces of Goebel, and the latter was directly opposite the large fountain urn in front of the old capitol, there came the report of a Marlin rifle. Goebel crumpled and fell. Four more shots were fired, but none took effect.[2] Goebel's friends rushed him to the basement of the Capitol Hotel for medical care, and on the following day, January 31, he was sworn in as governor of the commonwealth of Kentucky.[3]

News that Goebel had been shot spread through Kentucky like wildfire. Goebel Democrats were organized, and ready to go to Frankfort

[1] Louisville *Courier-Journal,* February 4, 1900. See, also, Lexington *Leader,* February 4, 1900.

[2] Louisville *Courier-Journal,* January 30, 1900. See, also, R. E. Hughes, F. W. Shaefer, and E. L. Williams, *That Kentucky Campaign; or the Law, the Ballot and the People in the Goebel-Taylor Contest* (Cincinnati, 1900), 241.

[3] Louisville *Courier-Journal,* January 31, 1900.

if necessary. Hundreds of persons thronged the small Kentucky River town, and a majority of these visitors were armed, not only with pistols but also with Winchester rifles.[4] So tense was the excitement that as the throng surged toward the Capitol Hotel, following the wounded Democratic leader, a Negro was crowded against a white man, and because of this he had a full round of pistol bullets emptied into him.[5] Behind this moment of near civil war in Frankfort there is a long and often devious story. What was the cause of this state of affairs? That is the burden of this paper.

Unlike the other Southern states, Kentucky retained her ante-bellum constitution until social and economic maladjustment forced the calling of a convention in 1890.[6] Because of the prevailing unfavorable economic conditions, the majority of the delegates who met in Frankfort on September 8 were representative of Kentucky's agrarian interest.[7] Corporations were the *bete noir* of the people. Counties had assumed burdens of bonded indebtedness to subsidize the building of railroads, and as agricultural prices fell in the eighties, special taxation and increasing freight rates became virtually confiscatory. It is little wonder that farmer-constitutionalists debated furiously the corporate sections of the constitution.[8] Railroads, obviously, were singled out as the most offensive corporations, and debates of control measures were expressed in terms of rates, pooling, rebates, drawbacks, and long and short hauls.[9]

Following the adoption of the present constitution in 1891, legislative plans were made to put it into effect. The legislature was called to meet in September, 1892, and remained in session for one year.[10] During

[4] There are many eastern Kentuckians who recall today having participated in this affair. See cartoons, *ibid.*, January 27, 1900. One of these comprises a half-page spread and portrays a shaggy, heavily armed body of drunken mountaineers.

[5] Hughes *et al.*, *That Kentucky Campaign,* 204.

[6] *Official Report of the Proceedings and Debates in the Convention,* 4 vols. (Frankfort, 1890), I, 3.

[7] Cassius M. Clay, an influential Bourbon County farmer, was elected president of the convention. *Ibid.*, 25.

[8] *Ibid.*, 3; IV, 4979-5182.

[9] *Ibid.*, I, 1506-1509; IV, 4979-5182, 5382-86.

[10] Lexington *Transcript,* September 6, 1893.

the "long parliament," as this assembly was called, an act to control corporations was passed on April 5, 1893. Governor John Young Brown, a professed friend of the "down-trodden" Kentucky farmers, refused to sign the bill largely because he believed it proposed to exercise too strict control over the Kentucky railroads.[11] In his message to the general assembly, he had proposed a railroad bill, but as a result of the influence which the Alliance vote exercised in the legislature, the Governor's plans went unheeded.[12] The bill passed by the assembly, over the executive veto, defined extortion on the part of the railroad company as the collection of more than reasonable passenger and freight rates. Not only did this act prohibit extortion through unfair rates, but it likewise forbade discrimination against cities and communities by use of drawbacks, rebates, and long and short hauls. Railroads which were believed to be guilty of extortion could be hailed into the local circuit courts or into the Franklin County court for trial. The Railroad Commission was instructed to investigate all such charges and to file the evidence with the court. If a railroad was found guilty, a fine of $500 to $5,000 was to be levied.[13]

A seven-year struggle for better regulation of railroads in Kentucky centered around this act. Between 1893 and 1900 a bill proposing to nullify the act of 1893 was introduced into each succeeding assembly.[14] In the meantime, a new political leader had forced his way to the front.

William Goebel began his legislative career in 1888 under the tutelage of John G. Carlisle at Covington. In the constitutional convention of 1890-1891, Goebel was a hard-working and unassuming young man who looked forward steadfastly to a successful political future. He became a legislative leader after 1891, and in 1895 he worked hard, but in vain, for the election of P. Wat Hardin to the governorship.[15] Unfortunately, Goebel's reputation was a bit soiled by his so-called duel

[11] *Ibid.*, March 4, 7, 25, 30, 1893.

[12] Kentucky *Senate Journal,* 1893, III, 3909, 3929, 3949.

[13] Kentucky *Acts,* 1893, Chap. 171, p. 612.

[14] For a typical example, see McChord bill, introduced as S. B. 19, in Kentucky *Senate Journal,* 1898, p. 59,

[15] P. Wat Hardin was a "hard-money" man.

with John Sanford in 1895, on the steps of the First National Bank of Covington. Sanford, a popular ex-Confederate soldier, was killed, and Goebel stood convicted in public opinion as a murderer.[16]

Following the election of William O. Bradley, Republican, to the governorship in 1895, the Democrats became aggressive. Bradley's administration faced strife at every turn. The general assembly was deadlocked, and the Governor was forced to call out the militia to prevent an open riot in the attempt to select a United States senator.[17] During the three years, 1895 to 1898, Goebel led the Democratic offensive.[18] The Senator from Kenton County had now ceased to be a dutiful heel-follower of the "hard-money" Carlisle; he was now a leader in his own right. Goebel was quick to sense the fact that political alignments in Kentucky were no longer based upon rigid hereditary partisan faiths, but upon economic conditions. Most of the Kentucky constituency was either agrarian or of agrarian origin, and the Kentucky farmers were panic-ridden. They needed a political Joshua to lead them from the wilderness of Republicanism and railroad abuse into a Jericho of Democracy and strict railway regulation. There were many volunteer Joshuas, but only one possessed the power to control the proper set of circumstances which was to make of him the people's high priest. That man was William Goebel.

Early in 1898 Goebel began his campaign against the Republicans, the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company, the crippled, blue-blooded, ex-Confederate soldier, W. J. Stone, and Hardin, Democratic martyr of 1895. Stone represented the "people," and Hardin, so it was said, was hand-picked by August Belmont and Milton H. Smith.[19] Before "King

[16] Lexington *Press-Transcript,* April 12, 13, 17, 1895. This paper was the weekly edition of the Lexington *Herald.*

[17] *Ibid.,* March 18, 25, 1896.

[18] Kentucky *Senate Journal,* 1896, p. 13.

[19] Louisville *Courier-Journal,* June 16-24, 1899, gives what is perhaps the best combined news and editorial account of the Music Hall Convention in which Senator Goebel won the nomination for governor. Henry Watterson said: "In the convention which nominated Mr. Goebel for governor, the L. & N. Railroad was the main factor. After a week of battle, day and night, Mr. Goebel beat this combination the combination of brute force and money, and won the nomination; doing to his competitors—whatever he did to them—that they were not ready to do to him. Every man, woman and child in Kentucky knows

William" of Kenton[20] could place himself before the people, however, he had to do a certain amount of political purging.[21] A disciple of Carlisle, Goebel was for a long time a hard-money man, but in 1898 hard money was unpopular with a majority of the Kentucky constituency. Also, Democrats were sore for they had blundered unforgivably in 1896 when they had become confused in the presidential election and believed that if they "crossed" the first name on the ticket they voted solidly Democratic. McKinley carried Kentucky twelve to one because of this error.[22] The Democratic cauldron was hot; not only had a Republican been elected to the governorship, but the state had gone Republican in a national election. As for his political past and his flirtation with the bewitching hard-money disciples, Goebel cared not at all. He even blithely slammed the political closet door shut tight when the opposition revived the rumor of Sanford's murder. Goebel knew the people of Kentucky were disgruntled at corporations, or more specifically at the railroads and the American Book Company. Farmers wanted free silver, Bryan, cheap freight rates, and cheap textbooks. Thus Goebel made the spearhead of his political campaign the McChord railroad bill, the election of Joseph S. C. Blackburn to the United States Senate, the Chinn textbook bill, free silver, Bryan, and the Goebel election law.[23]

Few sessions of the Kentucky general assembly have been burdened with more ripper legislation than was that of 1898. Early in the session, Charles C. McChord, senator from Washington County and formerly chairman of the Railroad Commission, submitted a bill to nullify the act of April 5, 1893, and to impose upon the Kentucky railroads the

this to be the truth." Quoted from Hughes *et al., That Kentucky Campaign,* 249. See, also, Louisville *Commercial,* June 17, 1899; and Lexington *Herald,* June 16-24, 1899. The editor of the *Herald* was bitterly opposed to Goebel's candidacy.

[20] Goebel was greeted with "Hail to William the Conqueror," or, by some more facetious friends as "King William I." These titles were bestowed upon him after he was extended the privilege of selecting the state election board.

[21] Lexington *Herald,* October 4, 5, 11, 1899.

[22] Lexington *Press-Transcript,* November 4, 11, 1896.

[23] S. B. 145, in Kentucky *Senate Journal,* 1898, p. 290. See, also, Lexington *Herald,* February 1-March 12, 1898.

strictest supervision by the state.[24] This bill was a masterpiece of legislative drafting, and, due, no doubt, to the fact that its sponsor had served for a long period as railroad commissioner, it showed a detailed knowledge of railroad operation in Kentucky. The McChord bill provided that when written complaint was made to the Railroad Commission by a shipper, either an individual or a corporation, accusing a railroad company of extortion or discrimination, the Commission was to give the railroad company ten days' notice of the time and place of hearing, and all evidence was to be submitted in writing. The Railroad Commission was entrusted with the right to determine and fix a just rate. It likewise was to act in a judicial capacity to determine the guilt of the railroad company. When a railroad was found guilty of extortion or discrimination it was made liable for a fine of $500 to $1,000 for the first offense, $500 to $2,000 for the second, and $2,000 to $5,000 for the third. Wisely Senator McChord stopped short of the suicidal brink for his bill when he provided that all cases in which the railroads were defendants under the law should be tried in the local circuit courts. Indictments before the courts were to be made by the Railroad Commission.

Upon the introduction of this bill, the legislature became the scene of a tug-of-war between the interests of the people and the interests of the railroads. Some of the Kentucky presses took an active part in the affray by raging and storming against the McChord bill. At Lexington, the grey-bearded Confederate, Colonel W. C. P. Breckinridge of the *Herald,* spent much editorial wrath against Goebel, McChord, and their legislative program. Beginning with his editorial of January 13, 1898, entitled "They Shirk Not," in which he said the legislature was definitely following the instructions of the steering committee composed of Goebel, McChord, Charles Bronston, Fenton Simms, J. C. Gillespie, and W. H. Jones, Colonel "Billy" dogged the progress of the McChord bill in his highly critical comments.[25] In Louisville "Marse" Henry Watterson

[24] Kentucky *Senate Journal,* 1898, p. 215.

[25] Daily editorials appeared in the Lexington *Herald,* January 13-March 2, 1898.

and his powerful *Courier-Journal* completely ignored the bill, except for the perfunctory news reports of the legislative progress.[26]

Breckinridge was accused by the Goebel supporters of being influenced by Milton Smith and August Belmont. In his campaign for governor in 1899, Goebel was direct in his attack upon Breckinridge. At Bowling Green the "people's candidate" declared, "I ask no quarter, and I fear no foe." This declaration of courage prefaced a bitter arraignment of the Lexington *Herald,* W. C. P. Breckinridge, the Louisville and Nashville Railroad, and former Governor Brown.[27] Believing, on February 16, 1898, that the McChord bill would at last become a law, even over Bradley's veto, Colonel Breckinridge reconciled its foes in the manner of one who attempts to comfort a community after a great calamity has befallen it. He believed the bill would not ruin the state, but would only be a nuisance and an obstacle to progress; that the restrictions in Kentucky would cause railroads to seek freight elsewhere at the expense of local shippers; that national competition would enforce regulation of rates; and that the shippers supplied the income to the railroads after all, a fact of which the railroads were thoroughly

[26] The position of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad was made known in the following confidential note from the company's lobbyist, Basil W. Duke, to William Lindsay, October 4, 1898, Huston Collection, University of Kentucky Library, Lexington: "Of course it is interesting to read of Henry's serious exhortations to Bryan and his backers to be good and put away ambition; but I hardly think he expects his advice to be accepted. I take it that this is only a way he has of trying to reach the fellows in the ranks under the pretext of lecturing the officers. The editorials—except that, as you say, any candidate named by Bryan would certainly be as objectionable as Bryan himself—contains a good deal of sense and meat. The trouble is Watterson has written recently so much wild-eyed rot, that no one pays any attention to him now even when he writes rationally. He has forfeited the confidence of all sides. I can't see how it is possible to ever rehabilitate the Democratic Party until the extremists in it have been brought to reason by most positive proof that they can't win on the Chicago platform; and even with that will now be difficult.

"I am convinced that any proper policy in Kentucky is to let the Republican candidates win this year if they can, especially I should like to see Jones beat Hobson after the unnecessarily aggressive position the latter has taken—and *beat Goebel for the gubernatorial nomination and commit the party to a repeal of his bill* [the election law]. If that be done, we may hope to get a legislature comparatively free from free silver cranks and which may be controlled by conservative Republicans and the small percentage of sound money democracy who may get in!"

[27] Hughes *et al., That Kentucky Campaign,* 75; daily editorials in Lexington *Herald,* June 1-November 4, 1898.

conscious. Breckinridge denounced the McChord bill as a purely political sop which was being given to the public because of its supposed wrought-up state of mind. He reasoned many times that "Kentucky is rich and tough; her people are frugal and industrious. Her resources are scarcely touched, and not even the present legislature can reduce her people to poverty."[28] On February 27 he lashed out at the "people's friends" in the legislature by stating that

> pool rooms and corporations that support the saints ought not to be disturbed. The Herald has profound pity for the poor weaklings whose backbone is mush and whose liver is white; who knows what is right, but who are too cowardly to stand up for their convictions and cower behind the hypocritical pretenses of caucus and regularity, poor, poor fellows! They can't help it, they are built that way. The Herald does not blame them—it pities them.

Goebel failed to achieve an important aim, for on February 31, 1898, Governor Bradley vetoed the McChord bill.[29] Again the *Herald* was quick to voice an opinion. Its editorial writer believed that Kentucky was saved from economic ruin for the Governor's action prevented legislation which meant confiscation at the hands of a partisan and ignorant Railroad Commission which would use its power to blackmail the railroads.[30] Linked to the McChord measure were two other bills of major significance on the Goebel agenda. These were the Chinn textbook bill and the Goebel bill "To Further Regulate Elections."[31] The debates on the McChord issue had stirred the general assembly to the boiling point. Bronston, a Democrat of Lexington, had aggravated the "horse starting" Chinn from Mercer County until an open fight appeared imminent. Bronston had substituted a book bill, and in recommending it over that introduced by Chinn, he had called the latter the "Mephistopheles of the legislature." Friends of both parties said Colonel Chinn had gone to Harrodsburg to get his gun—a statement which is utterly impossible to believe for surely Chinn had his gun with him. Breckinridge was quick to step into the dispute as peacemaker. He said, "We cannot believe that Colonel Chinn is angry at this; it is and evidently was meant

[28] See, for example, Lexington *Herald,* February 16, 1898.
[29] Lexington *Leader,* March 1, 1898.
[30] Lexington *Herald,* March 1, 1898.
[31] Kentucky *Acts,* 1898, p. 43.

to be complimentary; it is the only poetical and oratorical way of calling Colonel Chinn 'a hell of a fellow' and what true Kentuckian could fail to appreciate such a pleasantry."[32]

The Chinn book bill was defeated, but the Goebel election law was passed.[33] With the disposal of these three major bills, the legislators of 1898 returned to their respective trades: Colonel Chinn to start horses in the spring race meetings; Judge McChord to practice law; and, according to Colonel Breckinridge, Goebel "to make contingent fees against corporations."[34] Truly Goebel was mending old political fences and building new ones around greener pastures which encompassed more than a seat in the upper house of the general assembly.

The Democratic campaign opened in Kentucky early in the spring of 1899. Goebel, Hardin, and W. J. Stone stumped the state seeking the support of the county conventions. When the famous "Music Hall" convention met on June 21-30, 1899, Goebel was running a poor third in the number of committed delegates, but he was far in the lead of his opponents in ability to use keen strategy. He combined forces with Stone's delegation and organized the convention under Goebel rules.[35] After the election of Judge D. B. Redwine of "bloody" Breathitt as chairman, the business of disqualifying delegates was immediately begun. It has been said that the situation grew so hot in the convention hall that Judge Redwine attempted to leave the stage, but that he was met at the stage door by a fellow-mountaineer who swore he would kill him if he left his post. This much is certain. When an attempt was made to call the roll of the delegates, the melee became so boisterous that "Bob" Franklin, commonwealth's attorney from Franklin County, attempted to restore order by leading in the singing of "Old Hundred," "There'll Be a Hot Time in the Old Town Tonight," "On Jordan's Stormy Banks I Stand," "My Old Kentucky Home," and, as a last resort, "Just Break the News to Mother."[36]

[32] Lexington *Herald,* March 2, 1898.
[33] Kentucky *Senate Journal,* 1898, pp. 1022, 1145.
[34] Lexington *Herald,* March 2, 1898.
[35] Daily news stories and editorials in Louisville *Courier-Journal,* June 21-30, 1899.
[36] Hughes *et al., That Kentucky Campaign,* 34.

Goebel's nomination for governor, which came on the twenty-sixth ballot, split the Democratic party in Kentucky. At Lexington on August 2, former Governor Brown, a staunch standpatter, was selected as the "solid-gold, freedom-loving, honest election" candidate. Brown was burdened with the task of retrieving the Democratic party from the control of "cut-throats and assassins" which had taken possession of it in Louisville in June.[37] Ten days later the Republicans met in convention in Lexington and selected for their candidate a western Kentucky Republican, William Sylvester Taylor, who was then attorney general. The campaign was now under way. Mud slinging took place on every hand. The Louisville *Dispatch,* the Louisville *Times,* and the Louisville *Courier-Journal* carried numerous cartoons illustrative of campaign activities during October and November. The *Times* was diligent in criticizing the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company and its patron saints, Belmont and Smith. Cartoons pictured Smith as Satan sailing over ragged voters distributing coins from a cornucopia labeled "L. $ N. Treasury." Another represented a strong hand grasping a shock of hundred-dollar bills with Belmont's picture stamped upon one of them. The forearm was labeled "Anything or Anybody to Beat William Goebel."[38] Perhaps the cartoon that ruffled the "Honest Election" Democrats most was a pen sketch labelled "Trilby and Svengali" which pictured Brown in a striped nightshirt, pigeon-toed house slippers, and a heavily braided military coat, the epaulets of which bore the legend "L. $ N."; Brown in this cartoon was being hypnotized by Smith.

Goebel opened his campaign on August 12 at Mayfield in western Kentucky. Before he had spoken thirty minutes he fell forward on the table in a dead faint. In a few moments he was revived and entered into a stinging tirade against the Louisville and Nashville Railroad, and wound up by praising the merits of the McChord bill. He declared that the time had come for Kentuckians to decide "whether the L. & N. is

[37] Lexington *Herald,* August 3, 4, 1899.

[38] Duke wrote to Lindsay, October 4, 1898, "beat Goebel for the gubernatorial nomination and commit the party to a repeal of his bill." Huston Collection.

the servant or the master of the people."[39] At Hartford, a day later, Goebel denounced his opponents and accusers as "liars and scoundrels." He accused Hardin of having Louisville and Nashville support, for, said Goebel, Hardin's chief advocate at Louisville in June was James P. Helm, an attorney for the railroad who earlier in his career had received lush fees from Hardin when Helm was attorney general. Goebel arraigned Richard Knott, brother of a vice-president of the railroad company and editor of the Louisville *Post,* and John Whallen, president of the so-called "Honest Election League," as tools of the Louisville and Nashville.[40] At Bardwell, Goebel said to his audience:

> I have no doubt that if in the Louisville convention I had permitted Mr. Milton H. Smith and Mr. August Belmont to run the L. & N. political locomotive engine over me, in their judgment I would be an entirely proper person, not only to be governor of Kentucky, but to hold any other place within the gift of the people. But I did not see fit to do that. It has not been my custom to permit anything to run over me, and you can depend upon it that I shall not permit the L. & N. locomotive engine to run over me on the 7th of next November.[41]

While Goebel was slinging mud, his opponents were attacking him in every part of the state. They brought to light time and again the Sanford affair. Brown declared that Goebel was not an "1896 Chicago platform" Democrat, and Goebel was vehement in his denials. To offset the charges of infidelity to the cause of 1896, Goebel damned Brown for seeking and receiving Louisville and Nashville support.[42] The campaign wound up on November 6 with a hectic flourish; tension was high, and at many polling places disputes raged hot and furious.[43] When the official returns were finally made public it was found that Taylor had

[39] The inscription on the monument at Frankfort contains the word "corporation." See, also, Lexington *Herald,* March 29, 1898.

[40] Louisville *Courier-Journal,* March 7, 1898. "Marse" Henry was at outs with Louisville's pet corporation, and one that he had helped to promote. Even as late as 1918 he wrote his bosom friend Arthur Krock, editor of Louisville *Times,* "We owe the L. & N. nothing, not even good will. Especially should the S. o. B. ascertain where he stands." Watterson to Krock, January 4, 1918, in possession of Arthur Krock, New York City.

[41] Hughes *et al., That Kentucky Campaign,* 90.

[42] The Lexington *Herald* made frequent attacks upon Goebel because of an alleged change of heart. See *ibid.,* October 5, 1899.

[43] The state militia was called upon to patrol the polling places in Louisville. Louisville *Courier-Journal,* November 8, 1900.

received 193,714; Goebel, 191,331; and Brown, 12,140 votes. Republicanism, Smith, and Belmont had won again. Goebel and his wonderful election law were defeated![44] Even the Goebel-selected election board had to admit defeat.

Taylor was sworn in as governor of Kentucky on December 12. On January 2, 1900, the legislature met in regular session. By the seventh the Democrats had filed charges against Taylor and the whole Republican ticket. Both the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company and the American Book Company were charged with corrupting legislators and voters.[45] The Democrats demanded that the Louisville returns be voided because the state militia had patrolled the voting places, and claimed that the Louisville and Nashville had intimidated its employees in Jefferson, Warren, Hopkins, Christian, Knox, Whitley, Pulaski, Bell, and other counties. Votes in these counties were of sufficient number to elect Taylor. With these charges of willful corruption came a most peculiar accusation that the mountain counties had used "tissue paper" ballots. The Goebelites claimed these ballot forms were illegal.[46] When it was proposed to invalidate the mountain vote on the flimsy charge of its having been recorded on "tissue paper," mountaineers poured into Frankfort. These mountain guardians of the free right of franchise came armed with standard equipment for a Kentucky gentleman of that time, a "44" Colt revolver, a Winchester rifle, a jug of corn liquor, and a pack of cards. Obviously the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company had furnished free transportation. A special correspondent for the *Courier-Journal* said that fourteen coach loads of mountaineers were gathered from Bell, Harlan, Knox, Whitley, Laurel, Rockcastle, and Clay counties. This train carried seventy men to a coach, and "every passenger had to have a pistol to get a free pass. It was probably the roughest crowd ever gotten together in the mountains."[47] Another *Cou-*

[44] Goebel personally admitted defeat, and made preparations to visit a brother in Arizona. *Ibid.*, December 13, 1899.

[45] Kentucky *House Journal*, 1900, pp. 46-52.

[46] Daily news stories in Lexington *Leader*, January 2-30, 1900. Specific charges of fraud and irregularity in the election were made before the general assembly in the contest of William Goebel *v.* William S. Taylor. Kentucky *Senate Journal*, 1900, pp. 60-66.

[47] Louisville *Courier-Journal*, January 26, 1900.

rier-Journal correspondent said that Louisville and Nashville passengers bound for Frankfort were armed with moonshine, needleguns, squirrel guns, Winchesters, and "44's." The Middlesboro delegation, which was noted for its special ability to do either plain or fancy shooting on very short notice, was under the command of Congressman D. G. Colson, a descendant of a long line of avenging Appalachian grandsires.[48] On January 31 the Louisville and Nashville again ran a special train of seventeen coaches to Frankfort.[49] These wild drunken mountaineers were carried to the capital on the pretense of protecting their democratic rights to a free franchise; truly they were carried there for the purpose of intimidating a recalcitrant general assembly in its recount of the votes of the November election.[50]

While the outcome of the special electoral committee was still in doubt, the McChord bill was again introduced into the Senate. Since the Goebel faction controlled the assembly, the bill now had a splendid opportunity of being passed, even over an executive veto. After January 30, however, the whole legislative program was thrown into a hopeless state of turmoil; for several days Governor Taylor attempted to call a meeting of the assembly in Louisville, and, later, in London. It was late in February before the united assembly again met in Frankfort. The McChord bill was pushed rapidly toward passage. In the meantime, a new situation had come to exist and a second railroad bill was dumped into the legislative hopper. This one made it a misdemeanor for railroads to transport persons to any place in the commonwealth for the purpose of intimidating officials in the discharge of their duties.[51] On March 10 the McChord bill became a law.[52]

Six weeks before this piece of railroad legislation was enacted, William Goebel, the self-appointed "martyr" of Kentucky's great common people, had been cut down by an assassin's bullet in the midst of his

[48] *Ibid.*, January 27, 1900.

[49] *Ibid.*, February 1, 1900.

[50] *Ibid.*, January 27, 1900. This issue contains a full page cartoon depicting shaggy mountaineers guarding the statehouse.

[51] Kentucky *Acts*, 1900, pp. 7-9.

[52] *Ibid.*, 5-7. The original draft of this bill was lost for a time, and its friends suspected duplicity on the part of Taylor Republicans—a fact which created considerable excitement.

struggle against the state's all-devouring corporations. He had been governor of Kentucky for four days, January 31 to February 3. From February 3 to 6 his body lay in state in the Capitol Hotel in Frankfort. Faithful partisans passed his bier to shed tears, to mourn his passing, and to damn the people's enemies. Before Goebel's body could be consigned to the earth of the Frankfort Cemetery, friends insisted that it be taken to his home town of Covington to lie in state. From Frankfort to Covington the most direct route was over the Louisville and Nashville Railroad, but to place Goebel's body in a Louisville and Nashville coach, however, was to commit an unforgivable sacrilege. During his later years the determined and self-willed Goebel was active in opposing this large corporation, and it was a bit of irony that his corpse should make one last and dramatic physical protest. In order to form rail connection with northern Kentucky without going over the Louisville and Nashville line, friends engaged a special train on the rambling little Frankfort and Cincinnati Railroad which connected the two cities of its name. The morning of February 6 dawned dark and gloomy, a fine rain was falling, and it seemed that the whole world was in mourning as grief-stricken and tear-stained idolators placed Goebel's large black coffin aboard the dingy crepe-hung funeral train. At Cincinnati it was necessary to transfer this train to the Chesapeake and Ohio tracks and to dispatch it back across the Ohio River to its destination. Goebel was not buried until March 13, and by that time loyal legislator-friends at the foot of the steep Frankfort hill had completed his battle as a memoriam to his fight in behalf of the downtrodden common people.[53]

From 1900 to 1920 the Kentucky Railroad Commission functioned under the McChord law. Three times the law was brought before the Federal courts for appraisal. The first suit, Louisville and Nashville *v.* Charles McChord, Adam T. Siler, and McDougal Ferguson, individ-

[53] Goebel's burial is a matter of dispute. Was his body placed in the grave at the time of the funeral services or not? Hughes, Shaefer, and Williams say that it was not. The Lexington *Leader,* February 26, 1900, contains the notice that "Mr. Goebel's body is still in the vault [not the grave] at the cemetery. The date of interment has not been fixed." Judge James Benton and former Railroad Commissioner Urey Woodson were pall bearers and they have assured the author that it was buried at the time of the funeral; however, their assurances were made thirty-eight years later.

ually, and as constituting the Railroad Commission of Kentucky, was brought before Judge Andrew McConnell January Cochrane in the Circuit Court of Eastern Kentucky on July 24, 1906.[54] The Railroad Commission had received three complaints from J. Ed Guenther of Owensboro in which he accused the Louisville and Nashville, the Illinois Central, and the Louisville, Henderson, and St. Louis railroad companies of discrimination. His charges were based upon the differential between intrastate and interstate rates between Louisville and Owensboro, and Louisville and Evansville, Indiana. In 1908 the Railroad Commission appealed the case to the Supreme Court, which held the following year that the Commission was without power to make general rates for all goods to all parts of the state, but it did admit that the Commission had power to make specific rates. A second test of the McChord law was made in 1910 when the Louisville and Nashville increased its charges for the carriage of distillers' grains. The Greenbrier Distilling Company *et al.* complained against this increase in rates by the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company to the Railroad Commission. In its decision the Commission upheld the contentions of the distillers, and the decision was appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. Twice this case was brought before the high court, and in 1913 it upheld the action of the Kentucky Railroad Commission.[55]

Regulating the railroads in Kentucky has been ticklish business. No other state in the Union has confronted the same circumstances which existed in Kentucky at the time the most active efforts were being made to co-ordinate freight rates with agricultural prices. The Louisville and Nashville Railroad was a powerful corporation of local origin, and it was a predominating influence upon state legislation for a long period, but in 1900 it had definitely overplayed its hand.[56]

[54] *Twenty-Seventh Annual Report of the Railroad Commission* (Frankfort, 1906), 137-237.

[55] 231 U. S. 298.

[56] The Railroad Commission was reorganized in 1920. *Carroll's Kentucky Statutes* (Cleveland, 1936), secs. 201-18; Kentucky *Acts*, 1920, pp. 250-70.

New Viewpoints of Southern Reconstruction

By FRANCIS B. SIMKINS

The issues of most periods of American history have been so satisfactorily settled that they are now significant only as possible explanations of aspects of contemporary events and institutions. This is not true of the main issue of the Reconstruction period: the great American race question. It is almost as timely today as when it arose in 1865; as one of its prominent students says, like Banquo's ghost it will not down. Consequently, interpretations of the ten or twelve years following the Civil War seem destined, for an indefinite period, to have an influence beyond mere explanations of past events. The successful historian of Reconstruction, by revealing early phases of the still burning race question, arouses more attention among the reading public than is usually accorded historical works.

This continued survival of the leading issue of the post-bellum era explains why the interpretations of those years are so varied and numerous. Conservative scholars have described the follies and rascalities of Negro politicians and their Carpetbagger friends so as to make the reader thankful that such knavery cannot be repeated in his time. Less scrupulous writers have so effectively correlated the events of Reconstruction with those of their own times that their books have been best sellers. The outstanding example of this is Claude Bowers' *Tragic Era,* in which an attack upon the Republican enemies of Alfred E. Smith in 1928 is veiled behind attacks upon the Republican leaders of 1868, 1872, and 1876. At least one novelist has so effectively connected certain lurid aspects of Reconstruction with the race prejudices prevailing in the

South in his times that the situations he described have become a part of the Southern folk beliefs. The Ku Klux Klan is used as either a glamorous or sinister symbol for the arousal of issues of race, religion, and patriotism in which all Americans, radicals and reactionaries, Negro lovers and Negro haters, are vitally and perennially concerned. Reconstruction does not escape the attention of contemporary religionists; and even the Marxians, who would settle great social and economic issues, use Reconstruction experiences in their arguments.

A biased interpretation of Reconstruction caused one of the most important political developments in the recent history of the South, the disfranchisement of the blacks. The fraud and violence by which this objective was first obtained was justified on a single ground: the memory of the alleged horrors of Reconstruction. Later, amid a flood of oratory concerned with this memory, the white rulers of the South, in constitutional conventions of the 1890's and 1900's, devised legal means to eliminate the Negro vote. "Reconstruction," asserted the prime justifier of this act, "was this villainy, anarchy, misrule and robbery, and I cannot, in any words that I possess, paint it." These words of Ben Tillman were endorsed by all shades of white opinion from Carter Glass, Henry W. Grady, and Charles B. Aycock to Tom Watson, Hoke Smith, and James K. Vardaman.

Historians, sensing that the discrediting of the period in which the Negro most freely participated in politics justifies his subsequent exclusion from those activities, have condemned the Reconstruction measures as sweepingly as have the Southern politicians. They have called the military rule by which these measures were inaugurated "as brutish a tyranny as ever marked the course of any government whose agents and organs claimed to be civilized"; they have termed the best of the Carpetbaggers "infamous scoundrels"; and they have described the enfranchised freedmen as belonging to a race "incapable of forming any judgment upon the actions of men." The article on South Carolina in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* in all seriousness concludes: "All the misfortunes of war itself are insignificant when compared with the sufferings of the people during Reconstruction."

The masses of white Southerners accept these judgments as axiomatic. White Southerners will argue the issues of the Civil War and even the merits of the Democratic party, but there is scarcely one in a position of authority who will debate Negro suffrage and the related issues of Reconstruction. The wickedness of this regime and the righteousness of the manner in which it was destroyed are fundamentals of his civic code. Such a condemnation or commendation justifies the settlement of questions of the immediate past and are invoked to settle issues of even the remote future.

This extremely partisan judgment of still timely historical events imposes upon the historian of Reconstruction a serious civic duty. He must foster more moderate, saner, perhaps newer views of his period. This the present writer attempts to do in the light of his investigations of the processes of Reconstruction in the state where they were applied most radically.

The capital blunder of the chronicler of Reconstruction is to treat that period like Carlyle's portrayal of the French Revolution, as a melodrama involving wild-eyed conspirators whose acts are best described in red flashes upon a canvas. Such a treatment creates the impression that Southern society was frenzied by misery. This is at best the picturesque pageantry of the artist; at worst, the cheap sensationalism of the journalist or the scenario writer. At all odds it is woefully one-sided and unhistorical. Of course the South during Reconstruction, like France during the Revolution, had its prophets of despair, its fanatical idealists, its unprincipled knaves. Luckily the behavior of these damned souls is not the whole story of Reconstruction, but merely a partial recording of the political aspects of the era. Some of the political acts were as sane and constructive as those of the French Revolution. They were concerned with educational, constitutional, and political reform, and were instrumental in putting the Southern states in line with the progressive spirit of the nineteenth century.

The aberrations of the Reconstruction politicians were not accurate barometers of the actual behavior of the Southern people. The Reconstruction governments were not natural developments from the condi-

tions inherent in Southern life, but were, in a sense, artificial impositions from without. Frenzied politics did not necessarily reflect a frenzied social life. Despite strange doings in statehouses, the Southern people of both races lived as quietly and as normally during Reconstruction as in any politically disturbed period before or after. The defiance of the traditional caste division occasionally expressed in an official reception or in an act of the legislature was not reflected generally in common social relations. No attempt was made to destroy white supremacy in the social or economic sphere or to sanction interracial marriages. The political aggressiveness of the Negroes, characteristic of the period, did not extend to other phases of human relations. A staunch Republican voter was often a good servant in the house of a white Democrat. Negro officeholders who were aggressive politically were known to observe carefully the etiquette of the Southern caste system.

Moreover, in aspects of life not directly political there were achievements during the post-bellum era so quietly constructive that they have escaped the attention of most historians. This is true even of Du Bois, the colored author who ardently and extensively defends the Reconstruction record of his race.

Foremost among these achievements were agricultural reforms. While official agencies through Black Codes and the Freedmen's Bureau were making fragmentary and generally unsuccessful attempts to redefine a shattered rural economy, the freedmen bargained themselves into an agricultural situation unlike that of slavery and from their viewpoint advantageous. They worked beyond official purview. Although they were unable to gain legal title to the lands, they forced white competitors, for their labor in the expanding cotton fields, to establish them on separate farms in houses scattered over the land. This abandonment of the communal character of the Southern plantation bestowed upon the Negroes the American farmer's ideal of independent existence. This was a revolutionary reform more important in the actual life of the freedmen than the sensational but largely unsuccessful political changes attempted at the time. There followed the negotiation of share crop arrangements and other types of labor contracts between the freedmen

and the landlords. These agreements soon became fixed by custom. They proved to be a satisfactory *modus vivendi* and demonstrated the possibility of the two races living together in harmony under a regimen of freedom.

Changes scarcely less significant took place in the religious sphere. Under slavery autonomous Negro churches had not been tolerated and blacks were forced to attend churches directed both administratively and doctrinally by the master race. During Reconstruction the freedmen successfully asserted religious freedom and established independent churches. This secession was accomplished with a minimum of ill feeling and without important doctrinal or ritualistic innovations by the seceding groups. But it was a momentous change in social relations. It has been permanent, having never been challenged by even the most reactionary social forces. Its importance to a people so intensely religious as are Southerners of both races is obvious. The existence of perfectly independent Negro churches has given the black race opportunity for self-expression studiously denied it since Reconstruction in political and other nonreligious fields.

Another radical but constructive change of a nonpolitical character was the development of a new commercial system. The breakup of the plantations into small units created much small trade and a consequent demand for small credit. This was met by the creation of the crossroads stores and the commercial villages and towns with stores and banks. These new institutions were owned by an emergent economic group, the storekeepers, who dominated the Southern community as effectively, if not as glamorously, as the planters had once done. The storekeepers were often also bankers, planters, church deacons, and sometimes state senators. Their power was based on large profits realized from the new system of credit advances on unharvested crops.

The assertion that the abnormalities of post-bellum politics did not adequately reflect the actualities of Southern life leads to the conviction that a balanced understanding of the period cannot be had without descriptions of social life. The social activities of both races remained relatively wholesome and happy; there was little of the misery, hatred,

and repression often sweepingly ascribed to it by writers. There were camp meetings, dances, balls, tournaments, picnics, parades, agricultural fairs, lavish banquets, and indulgence in the vanities of personal adornment. There was, of course, much poverty, the shadow of the Lost Cause, and apprehension concerning possible events in the political world. But there were fresh memories of heroic events, and there were surviving warriors to give glamorous reality to these memories. Gaiety was disciplined by recent tragedy, but it was not dampened by the utilitarianism of a more progressive age.

The claim that the times were completely dominated by stark pessimism is refuted by the fact that during Reconstruction the optimistic concept called the New South was born. It is true that predictions concerning a new civilization springing from the ruins of slavery and the Confederacy were premature. It was ridiculous to call newspapers established amid the ruins of Columbia and the rice plantations *The Phoenix* and *The New South.* But the spirit of progress abroad in the land was not stifled by varied difficulties. It was fostered by some hopeful actualities—a new commercial life, the new banks, the high price of cotton, and the new agriculture made possible by the first extensive use of commercial fertilizer. An optimistic note was reflected in the newspapers. When in the 1880's this hopefulness germinated in the actualities of new industries and a philosophy of progress and reconciliation, it was from the seeds sown in the two previous decades.

In one sense, those who have essayed books on Reconstruction have closed their narratives before the actual reconstruction of the South began. The Northern reformers who arrived in the 1860's and 1870's carrying carpetbags were driven out by Southerners armed with shotguns before these outsiders could make their projects effective. But a later generation of Northern reformers, coming mostly in the twentieth century, have experienced a different reception. Riding in expensive automobiles, emanating an aura of wealth, this later generation have, through lavish expenditures, received the enthusiastic co-operation of Southerners. They have introduced Northern ideals of literature,

architecture, and landscaping, and have instilled into the Southern mind a definite preference for Northern concepts of civilization.

Those of us who are not willing to accept this thesis that the true reconstruction did not come until years after the so-called Reconstruction, should nevertheless feel obligated to watch for evidence during the 1870's of the beginnings of the industrial, cultural, and psychical conquest by the North of the South which has shown itself so clearly in recent decades. Perhaps hidden beneath the seemingly premature and erratic actions of the Carpetbaggers were plans which have been executed by the rich Northerners of the twentieth century.

As has been suggested, one of the most striking features of Southern society is the color line. This division under slavery was not as sharp as it is today. The influences of Reconstruction induced this sharpening. The aggressiveness of the blacks and their allies caused resentment among the whites and consequent estrangement between the races. This alienation in turn caused the blacks, especially in social and economic relations, to grow more independent. If this thesis is true, the careful student of the post-bellum period is obligated to isolate those interests and attitudes which account for the intensification of the caste division of Southern society. In doing this he will perhaps help explain the most important reality of interracial relations.

One of the accepted conventions of Reconstruction scholars is that the Carpetbaggers failed because their measures were excessively radical. We have often been told how the Four Million were suddenly hurled from slavery into freedom; how black barbarians were forced to attempt the roles of New England gentlemen; how seven hundred thousand of these illiterates were given the vote and the privilege of office-holding. But were these measures genuine radicalism, actual uprootings which inevitably led to fundamental changes in Southern society? The answer is that they were scarcely more than artificial or superimposed remedies from the outside which in no real sense struck at the roots of Southern life.

A truly radical program would have called for the confiscation of land for the freedmen. Land was the principal form of Southern wealth,

the only effective weapon with which the ex-slaves could have battled for economic competence and social equality. But the efforts of the Freedmen's Bureau in the direction of land endowments for its wards were fitful and abortive. Conservative constitutional theory opposed any such meaningful enfranchisement. The dominant Radicalism of the day naïvely assumed that a people's salvation could be obtained through the ballot and the spelling book. The freedmen got these but were allowed to continue in physical want, and even lost the industrial skills and disciplines they had inherited from slavery. No wonder they carried bags in which to bear away their suffrage and expected education to place them at the tables of the rich and competent. They were realists and their so-called benefactors were the deluded ones. Wise Tory statesmen like Bismarck, Lord Salisbury, and Alexander II would have put something in their bags and endowed them with tangible social privilege.

In another vital respect the so-called Radicals of the 1860's lost an opportunity to attempt genuine radicalism. They did not try to destroy the greatest obstacle to the Negroes' salvation, the Southern caste system. Contemporary professions of such attempts lack sincerity. Anglo-Saxon race pride, New England standards of civilization, a respect for narrowly Protestant standards of morality were in the way. Attempts at fraternization between the races were stilted official affairs lacking in that unconscious informality on which true sociability must be based. No one was ever allowed to forget that race distinctions existed.

A distinguished Negro lecturer recently stated that the whole truth is not told by those books which assert that the blacks and their coadjutors were the sole aggressors of the Reconstruction period. Revolution was attempted on both sides. The blacks, of course, on their part, were sufficiently aggressive to demand the continuation of freedom and the vote and the liberties implied in these terms. But the whites also showed an aggressiveness which went beyond the maintenance of their traditional position in Southern society. They tightened the bonds of caste; they deprived the subordinate caste of many occupational opportunities enjoyed under slavery; they drove colored farmers from the land; they gradually deprived the blacks of a well-integrated position and imposed

on them a status akin to pariahs whom many wished exiled. The disappearance of aristocratic prejudices against many forms of honest labor created the conviction that it was possible for Southern society to function without the despised African. Certainly an appraisal of the helplessness of the blacks at the close of the Reconstruction era makes one wonder why the whites are not more often adjudged the actual revolutionaries of the times. Victory was in white hands—the actuality as well as the sentiment and the tradition.

Several generations of historians have asserted that the Reconstruction governments were so grievously corrupt and extravagant that they checked all efforts at material rehabilitation. There was, of course, corruption and waste—expensive spittoons, thousand dollar bribes, fraudulent bonds, and so on. But the actual financial burdens of government which tolerated such acts have been exaggerated. Their expenditures seem small when compared with the budgets of twentieth-century states and extravagant only against the parsimony of the governments immediately preceding and following. The extravagant bond issues of the Reconstruction governments were not an immediate burden upon contemporaries and afflicted subsequent generations only to the extent to which they were not repudiated. The Radical governments, like the government of Louis XVI in France, failed not because their expenditures were burdensome but because they did not enjoy enough power and respect to force the taxpayers to yield funds sufficient to discharge the obligations of effective political establishments. There was a taxpayers' strike rather than a tax collectors' orgy. Some Reconstruction governments could not pay their gas bills.

A reinterpretation of the tax policies of the Radical regimes suggests a new explanation of the odious reputations possessed by these governments. Of course, a partial answer is that there was corruption and incompetence. Illiterate freedmen were easily seduced by unscrupulous Carpetbaggers and Scalawags. But were these malpractices the most serious offenses of the Reconstructionists? It seems that the worst crime of which they have been adjudged guilty was the violation of the American caste system. The crime of crimes was to encourage Negroes

in voting, officeholding, and other functions of social equality. This supposedly criminal encouragement of the Negro is execrated ever more savagely as with the passing years race prejudices continue to mount. Mild-mannered historians declare that the assertiveness resulting therefrom was grotesque and abnormal, while the more vehement writers call it the worst of civic scandals. Attempts to make the Reconstruction governments reputable and honest have been treated with scorn, and the efforts of Negroes to approach the white man's standards of civilization are adjudged more reprehensible than the behavior of the more ignorant and corrupt. Social equality and negroism have not a chance to be respectable.

Such views logically grow out of the conviction that the Negro belongs to an innately inferior race and is therefore incapable by his very nature of exercising with sagacity the higher attributes of civilization. James Ford Rhodes gives the viewpoint of moderate historians by declaring the Negro to be "one of the most inferior races of mankind" and by endorsing Brinton's theory of the Negro's arrested development at adolescence. John W. Burgess voices the opinions of the more prejudiced when he says: "The claim that there is nothing in the color of the skin is a great sophism. A black skin means membership in a race of men which has never succeeded in subjecting passion to reason." Less critical writers take such statements as so obviously true that they need no specific affirmation.

The impartial historian, however, cannot so readily endorse this finding. His knowledge of the conclusions of modern anthropology casts grave doubts on the innate inferiority of the blacks. This knowledge, indeed, creates the necessity of explaining the conduct of the Negroes, during Reconstruction as well as during other times, on other than racial grounds. It also leads to the rejection of the gloomy generalization that the race, because of its inherent nature, is destined to play forever its present inferior role.

Loose assertions concerning Reconstruction as an attempt to return to the ideals of the jungle, as an effort to rebarbarize the Negro and to make South Carolina and Mississippi into African provinces, seem to

have no basis in truth. Indeed, the exact opposite seems nearer the truth. Reconstruction can be interpreted as a definite step forward in the Anglicization or the Americanization of the blacks, certainly not their Africanization. The sagacious William A. Dunning tells the truth when he asserts that the newly-liberated freedmen were "fascinated with the pursuit of the white man's culture." This passion did not abate during the later years of Reconstruction; it is still a dominant feature of Negro life. The zeal with which the ex-slaves sought the benefits of literary education is unparalleled in history; this was the most obvious means of assimilating the white man's culture. Although Negro society during the first years of freedom tended to grow independent of white society, it continued to imitate the culture of the superior caste. Among the more cultivated Negroes, the more independent their society is of the whites', the stronger the resemblance. The radical changes in Negro religion which grew out of freedom were not in the direction of Africa, but rather in the direction of frontier or backwoods America, with some imitations of Fifth Avenue standards of clerical correctness. The misbehavior of Negro politicians had no African coloring. Their bad manners were those of American rustics and their vices were not unlike those of contemporary Tammany politicians. It is true that variations in the dialect of the Southern Negroes were most pronounced in the years after the war, or at least they were then best recognized; but even in the Gullah speech of the Sea Islands, African words did not predominate.

The efforts of certain Negroes of the post-bellum period to establish African connections were abortive. When cultured Negroes of the type of Martin R. Dulany tried to discover their African ancestors, they were guilty of a fatuous Americanism, different only in one respect from that of those Americans who trace their ancestors in England: the African quest could not be successful. The influences of slavery had resulted in such a thorough Americanization of the blacks that little African was left in their culture. This was the main reason why the efforts during Reconstruction to promote emigration to Liberia were a dismal failure. There was no more cultural affinity between the Southern Ne-

gro and his African blood kin than between the American Negro and the Chinese.

The aspersions on the freedmen for emulating the white man's culture have been as unfair as the criticisms of them for the alleged attempt to Africanize the South. Numerous writers have ridiculed sooty women for wearing veils and gloves, for carrying umbrellas, for calling themselves "Mrs." and "Miss," and for retiring from the fields to establish firesides and homes. Likewise, the spectacle of Negro politicians trying to talk like Daniel Webster or Charles Sumner has caused jest, and undue emphasis has been placed upon the impracticability of the attempt to load the curricula of Negro schools with items of classical culture adapted from New England. But are these criticisms just? It is granted that such aspirations after the white man's culture were often the result of uncritical enthusiasms and were beyond the immediate reach of an inexperienced people turned loose naked in the world. But measured according to the unescapable standards of American civilization, were these aspirations in the wrong direction? Were they not in the direction all Americans, including even those relegated to the lowest caste, seek to travel? The major problem of the American Negro is to attain the standards of American civilization. This is a decree of circumstances which the American Negro has accepted without reluctance. Therefore, the Reconstructionists who held Boston and Massachusetts up as ideals for the blacks were not giving the wrong advice. The fact that this advice moved the Negroes profoundly, if not always sagaciously, is a tribute to the sound instincts of these blacks and of their Reconstruction mentors.

Historians of the South should adopt a more critical, creative, and tolerant attitude toward so important a period in the annals of their section as Reconstruction. This will promote truth and scholarship in the austere sense of those terms. It will do more. It will banish that provincialism which is based on priggishness and ignorance of comparisons; it will fortify the sound provincialism born of better understanding of one's own province; and it will enrich those measured evalua-

tions which are possible only after contact with other people's provinces. A better comprehension of the Reconstruction past will aid in the solution of the South's great race problem. Bias and passion should be explained in rational terms in order that contemporaries may better understand the forces motivating them. In this modest way the great civic obligation of the historian can be discharged.

The Fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Historical Association

By PHILIP DAVIDSON

From an idea in the fall of 1934 to an organization of eight hundred members, from a meeting of a score of historians in an Atlanta hotel room to a three-day session with thirty papers—this is the phenomenal four-year record of the Southern Historical Association. The Association grew out of the increasing interest in Southern history and has itself contributed vitally to the promotion of historical scholarship. This was evident at the fourth annual meeting, held in New Orleans, November 3-5. The stimulus of the Association is clearly seen in the number of new people on the program, the number of new research projects discussed at every turn, and the intellectual vigor that was felt at every meeting.

The Program Committee arranged a much larger program than had been attempted before. Beginning Thursday morning, the meeting lasted until Saturday afternoon; in that interval, fifteen separate sessions were held. Southern history of the ante-bellum period and the problems of locating and preserving the sources for Southern history were the matters of principal concern in the program as arranged. The increasing importance of the work of the Federal government is seen in the number of government men on the program and in the fact that two meetings were devoted entirely to certain government projects. All of the sessions were well attended, and a great deal of interest was displayed in the exhibit of books, pictures, maps, and documents provided by the American Buildings Survey, the Federal Archives Survey, the

Federal Writers project, the Cabildo project, and the New Orleans City Hall project.

The two sessions which began the meeting of the Association on Thursday morning were both held in the St. Charles Hotel. Charles W. Ramsdell presided over the meeting which discussed the Southern plantation. The general subject, "Plantation Management," was specifically treated in three papers. Edward E. Everett of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, read the first paper, "The Southern Plantation: A Consideration of Its Nature and Persistence as an Agriculture Unit." Mr. Edwards traced the history of the plantation as a unit of agricultural production and of rural life through its many vicissitudes. Its principal characteristics were discussed in terms of the three major chronological periods—the Colonial, the ante-bellum, and the post-bellum—and of the major commodities produced—tobacco, rice, cotton, and sugar cane. The plantation in each of the periods was discussed as an efficient unit for the production of staples, and at the close of his paper Mr. Edwards raised the question as to whether the plantation has not served its function and deserves to be replaced by some other unit.

Marjorie Mendenhall's paper, which was read by C. Vann Woodward, dealt with the plantation in terms of an individual planter, James Henry Hammond. Hammond wanted to be a statesman, but a personal indiscretion and Southern moralists determined that he would be a planter instead of a senator. Hammond determined to duplicate on the depleted soils of South Carolina the great cotton yields of rich Southwestern lands. He first tried Edmund Ruffin's idea of using marl on old land, but had to abandon the project. He then tried the mixed system of grain growing, cattle raising, and cotton culture advocated by N. B. Cloud of Alabama. He finally achieved financial success by reverting to the old Southern custom of exploiting new land, land he obtained by draining swamps. Later he advocated a balanced economy and himself became interested in cotton manufacturing.

Walter Prichard of Louisiana State University read the final paper, "The Effects of the Civil War on the Louisiana Sugar Industry." The

war, Mr. Prichard showed, almost annihilated the industry. From an annual production of four hundred and sixty thousand hogsheads, the output fell to a mere ten thousand. Cotton came back in quantity at least by 1880, but it was not until 1893 that the sugar industry was back to the prewar level. Scarcity of capital and labor militated against it during and after Reconstruction, he said, and it was not until many small mills had been eliminated and laborsaving machinery introduced that advances could be made.

Concurrently with this meeting, another was being held to discuss the activities of the National Park Service. William R. Hogan, assistant archivist at Louisiana State University, presided, and Ronald F. Lee, supervisor of historic sites, the National Park Service, read the first paper. Under the subject, "Objectives and Policies in the Conservation of Historic Sites," Mr. Lee discussed the work in the South of the National Park Service. The Federal government grouped all the national historic areas under the department of the interior in 1933, and in 1935 the Historic Sites Act gave to the Secretary extensive powers for the survey of historic and archeological sites, and for the development in co-operation with state and local governments of a national program for their conservation. The objectives of the newer Federal policies include the desire to integrate the activities of many hitherto separate agencies, to encourage state legislation, and to bring the scientific approach to the problem of locating and preserving historic sites.

Malcolm E. Gardner, acting superintendent of the Natchez Trace Parkway project, gave a full discussion of the problems involved in tracing and developing a specific historic site. In "The Natchez Trace as an Historic Site Problem," Mr. Gardner reviewed briefly the history of the Trace from its beginnings as a series of Indian trails to a national road—the first one established—connecting Nashville and Natchez, outposts in 1800 of American and Spanish influence in the Southwest. Mr. Gardner described the project of the Trace as a research problem, involving interpretation of documentary material, careful location work on the ground, the identification of map and documentary material with

original sites, and the use of engineering, architectural, and archeological methods.

Roy E. Appleman, acting regional historian, the National Park Service, concluded the session with a discussion of some plans of the Park Service. In his paper, "The Survey of Historic Sites in the South," he listed the more important sites being considered for Federal ownership; among them are Cumberland Gap, Boonesborough, Fort Raleigh, Fort Fredericka, and Chalmette battlefield. He also discussed the possibilities of co-operative effort in the conservation of St. Augustine and of the Vieux Carré in New Orleans, but pointed out the difficulties of working within cities, where more private enterprise and property are affected than in rural areas.

At the conclusion of these two sessions, the members of the Association met at La Louisiane Restaurant for a luncheon conference on the applicability of Frederick Jackson Turner's theories to the South. Avery Craven of the University of Chicago discussed the question, "To What Extent Do the Theories and Studies of Frederick Jackson Turner Constitute a True Interpretation of the Development of the South?" He first outlined briefly what he called the Turner approach to American history—that throughout the formative period the ever succeeding Wests were the most typical and influential portions of the nation, and that these Wests each in turn became an East, "leaving the future to sectional and class conflicts." Mr. Craven then showed that Turner himself undoubtedly believed that his approach fitted the facts of Southern history, but that he would have considered his theory in itself a true interpretation of the South or of any other section was most unlikely. No one doubts, asserted Mr. Craven, that the Turner approach fits perfectly the history of the coastal and piedmont South; the real problem concerns the application of the thesis to the Southwest. Here conditions were so complex that Turner himself was uncertain, and many have since frankly denied that the Western process was continued in the South, viewing the entire South as a unique entity in the national pattern. Some have seen the class struggle as the dominant note, others the race problem, and yet, said Mr. Craven, the vigorous advance into the

Southwest had all the characteristics usually ascribed to the Western movement. There were the usual stages of development—trapping, cattle driving, mining, small farming, and planting. There were the flavor and practices of the frontier. There were the same crudeness, the same lack of inhibitions, the same stirrings of democracy and nationalism that characterized every other "West." Of the Southwest he therefore concluded, "It was Southern; yet it was thoroughly Western." Benjamin B. Kendrick of the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina led the discussion which followed. He accepted, he said, the Turner thesis as *a* true interpretation, but in the light of present interests (Turner himself once said, "Each age tries to form its own conception of the past") a better key to the interpretation of Southern history would be found in the fact that the South has always been a debtor section. The Southwest, however, was not debtor to its parent area and could thus unite with it better than could the Northwest with the Northeast, to which it was debtor. There was less social difference between the South and the Southwest than between the North and the Northwest. These facts, he argued, do not vitiate the Turner thesis, but they tend to make it less applicable to the South than to other sections.

Two sessions were held Thursday afternoon, one on "Aids to Historical Research," presided over by James A. McMillen of Louisiana State University, the other on the subject, "The North and the South," in charge of Culver H. Smith of the University of Chattanooga. In the first session, Barnes F. Lathrop of the University of Texas described a project of the University of Texas for microfilming materials for Southern history. The material so far filmed falls within the period from 1820 to 1880, and was taken from depositories from Massachusetts to Louisiana; it includes manuscripts, broadsides, newspapers, pamphlets, and books. Twenty-one thousand feet of film, covering nearly a quarter of a million pages, have already been taken, and the project is to be continued another year. A body of extremely valuable material for Southern students is thus rapidly being accumulated.

John C. L. Andreassen, of the Historical Records Survey, reported in his paper, "Inventory of Manuscript Collections in the South," that the

survey will result in published products of three types: (1) a general guide to all depositories of manuscript collections in the South, (2) state guides to manuscript collections, and (3) calendars and inventories of specific collections. Many states and localities, said Mr. Andreassen, have already begun publication of guides and calendars.

In the session on the North and the South, V. Alton Moody of Iowa State College read the first paper, "Northern Trade with the South in the Ante-Bellum Period." The South, said Mr. Moody, in spite of efforts to make it self-sufficing, has produced staples and bought supplies. When the direct trade of the South with Europe was cut off, the North took over the Southern trade and soon came to look on the region as an indestructible market for its goods. The effects of this trade on the two regions differed widely. In the North, it resulted, for example, in commercial farming. In the South, its effects were harmful. It led to the neglect of stock and grain raising, raised the price of land, helped fasten the factorage system on the South, and controlled the destinies of whole towns and communities.

B. I. Wiley of the University of Mississippi described the effects of another type of Northern invasion. In "The Impact of Federal Invasion on the Institution of Slavery," Mr. Wiley found that the faithful slave of postwar panegyrics was almost wholly fictional. He showed that one of the immediate consequences of the arrival of Federal troops was the flight of many slaves to the Union lines. The slaves also became more insolent and insubordinate. That they did not resort to a general insurrection is attributable, concluded Mr. Wiley, not so much to the slaves' affection for their masters as to their inability to organize and to their fear of summary punishment.

The final paper in this session, "The South and Northern Democratic Congressional Leaders during Reconstruction and After," was delivered by Albert V. House, Jr., of Wilson Teachers College. It has been assumed, asserted Mr. House, that the Democratic leaders in Congress during Reconstruction battled valiantly but vainly for the South against the plans of the Radical Republican leaders. A study of the documents, however, shows that though these Democratic leaders fought to protect

the South from the political and social ravages of the Radicals, they joined with them in the economic exploitation of the region. Talk and negative action were the contribution of most of the Democratic leaders to the solution of Reconstruction problems, charged Mr. House, but at least two men, Senator Allen G. Thurman and Speaker Samuel J. Randall, deserve study as constructive leaders.

On Thursday night there was held a joint dinner of the Southern Historical Association and the Louisiana Historical Society. Edward Alexander Parsons of the Louisiana Historical Society and Wendell H. Stephenson of the Southern Historical Association presided over the occasion. Mr. Parsons spoke on the subject, "A Pirate's Tale," retelling with charm the story of Jean Lafitte. He exhibited documents relating to Lafitte and the battle of New Orleans now in possession of the Historical Society. E. Merton Coulter read a paper called "How the Other Half of New Orleans Lived." By 1840 the fame of New Orleans had attracted an adventuresome lot from all over the country, and when these outsiders were joined with the irresponsible elements produced by the city itself, a sizeable police problem was created. Mr. Craven had said in his paper that in one period of twenty-three months forty-seven thousand minor crimes were committed in New Orleans, and it was with such crimes and the reporting of them that Mr. Coulter was concerned. The court reporter for the New Orleans *Picayune* was on hand every morning at the Recorder's Court and described the hearings with much humor and a profound knowledge of human nature. With equal humor Mr. Coulter passed on the reporter's descriptions to the dinner guests.

Two sessions Friday morning, one at the St. Charles Hotel, the other on the Tulane University campus, concerned the past and future of the South. At the St. Charles Hotel three capable papers were grouped around the general theme, "Suggested Points of View for the Future Historian of the South." Mr. Kendrick presided and presented first Miss Kathryn T. Abbey of Florida State College for Women, who read for Richard Shryock, University of Pennsylvania, a paper, "Culture Patterns in the South." Interpretation of general history, wrote Mr. Shryock, unless we are to abandon the whole concept of causation, must proceed in

terms of the three major factors which influence the lives of people—their biological nature, the particular culture they possess, and their environment. The complexities created by these variables have made a definite account of any period or people almost impossible, and historians have therefore emphasized one or the other of these three. Early Southern writers, for example, so emphasized the cultural inheritance of the settlers that by 1860 the cavalier tradition dominated much of the thought and writing of the section. At the same time, and bolstering up the tradition, biological interpretations of Negro inferiority and white superiority became strongly intrenched in the Southern mind. Lasting for many years even after the Civil War, these ideas were finally attacked by those who stressed geographic factors. The geographic determinists themselves are now being undermined by those who have reverted to the older ideas of cultural influences. This pendulum-like swing is indicative, thought Mr. Shryock, of a low level of scientific methodology. To remedy the condition, he proposed briefly that scientific studies be made of instances in which one factor was constant and the others were variable, as in the case of English and German settlers in the same general environment.

The second paper, "Population Structure of the Late Ante-Bellum South," by Frank L. Owsley of Vanderbilt University, was a preliminary report upon an intensive study of unpublished county records and Federal census reports. An examination of these records makes a revision of the stereotyped view of Southern society imperative. Instead of three classes, there were many shadings between the two extremes of great slaveholders and poor whites. There were moderately wealthy planters, small planters, and the slaveholding farmers. Farther down the scale were the nonslaveholding farmers who owned their own land and made up the bulk of the nonslaveholders, the renters, and the squatters on government land. By 1860 the landless renters and squatters had largely been absorbed into the landowning class.

The final paper in this session was read by Harry E. Moore of the University of Texas. In his paper, "Future Regions of the United States," Mr. Moore discussed the meaning and significance of the term regional-

ism. It varies from geographic determinism, said Mr. Moore, in that geographic factors influence but do not control. Communication and transportation are the chief factors in setting the pattern of relationships which characterize the region. The region is distinguished from the section in that the latter seeks autonomy, whereas the former sees itself as an integral portion of the whole. The growing popularity of the regional approach through synthesis rather than analysis, and the growth of regional organizations in political, social, and commercial fields, led Mr. Moore to the conclusion that the future historian will find the regional approach of great value and significance.

While the session on the South and the future historian was under way, Gerald M. Capers, Jr., was presiding over a discussion of the development of science in the South. George Adams of Lake Forest College read an interesting paper on "Medical Theory and Practice in the Confederacy." The Civil War was unfortunately fought at the very end of the medical middle ages, but it did give Southern physicians great opportunities for clinical and surgical practice. Pioneer work was done in the prophylactic use of quinine to ward off malaria, for example, and the practice of bleeding and of treatment in tightly closed rooms were abandoned. The accidental discovery that maggots could clean out a badly infected wound, bringing at times almost miraculous recoveries, anticipated by sixty years the larval therapy worked out in the 1920's. On the other hand, careless vaccination spread syphilis and other serious infections, and the complete failure of the troops to observe ordinary sanitary regulations killed more troops than did Yankee Minié balls. Poor as was the theory and practice of medicine, concluded Mr. Adams, they were good enough to have saved half the hundred and fifty thousand men who died of disease had the government been able to provide the necessary supplies to the soldiers, and had the rank and file of the troops known enough to observe sanitary regulations.

Charles Sydnor of Duke University read the second paper. Under the title, "The Theory and Practice of Geology in the South," the paper showed that the interest in geology manifested itself largely in geological surveys, authorized at public expense in every Southern state except

Florida and Louisiana. These surveys, many of them carried on under the auspices of state universities, resulted in the publication of some fifty books and pamphlets. These reports contain a great deal of material of interest to others than geologists; planters, for instance, insisted that the reports include information of value to farmers. There is so much variety in fact, that modern historians can use the reports with profit.

The final paper in the session on the development of science was read by Arthur R. Hall, Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Mr. Hall discussed the soil conservation techniques employed by farmers in the South Carolina piedmont prior to 1860. The serious soil depletion and the extensive erosion in this area necessitated better farming practices, and five conservation techniques were developed: (1) deep and horizontal plowing, (2) hillside ditching, (3) development of grass crops, (4) manuring and rotation of crops, and (5) timber conservation. Because clean tilled crops—cotton and corn—continued to dominate the agriculture of the region, the mechanical techniques, such as horizontal plowing and ditching, were most commonly and most successfully used.

The members of the Association assembled at Kolb's Restaurant at twelve-thirty for a luncheon conference on printed source materials. John R. Pomfret of Vanderbilt University presided, and the only scheduled address was made by Douglas C. McMurtrie, American Imprints Inventory, the Historical Records Survey. Mr. McMurtrie's discussion was a description of the invaluable work of the American Imprints Inventory, which is making a national survey of printed source material. Plans were laid for the inventory at the Nashville meeting of the Southern Historical Association. By now twelve hundred workers are engaged in recording, in libraries all over the country, books, pamphlets, broadsides, and other items printed in the United States prior to 1877. The titles are sent to a clearing house in Chicago, where they are filed by place of printing and date. From these files regional lists of early imprints are compiled, edited, and issued in mimeographed form. The work of the Imprints Inventory is indispensable to those working in any local field.

A paper by A. F. Kuhlman, director of the Joint University Libraries, Vanderbilt University, scheduled for the session on "Aids to Historical Research," was read by Robert J. Usher of the Howard Memorial Library, New Orleans. Mr. Kuhlman issued a note of warning under the title, "The Next Steps in the Collection, Organization, and Preservation of Historical Source Materials in the South." Too much rugged individualism and outright competition have resulted in wasteful duplication and missed opportunities for co-operation on large scale projects. The suggested lines of development for Southern research libraries are the filming of printed sources, careful surveys of existing research material and the preparation of guides to it, and the development of regional rather than local research libraries. In these activities the co-operative method must be completely substituted for the older and more wasteful competitive method.

No papers were scheduled for Friday afternoon, the members of the Association being invited to a tea given by Tulane University. An opportunity was thus given the members to examine the Tulane collection of Middle American artifacts and documents.

The annual dinner of the Association, presided over by Rufus C. Harris, president of Tulane University, was held at Antoine's Restaurant. Philip M. Hamer, president of the Association, delivered his presidential address, a discussion of the problems involved in the preservation of documents for Southern history. In the past, he said, documents have been used to kindle fires, to light pipes, and to make beds, and have been left in every conceivable place from moldy basements to penitentiaries. Mr. Hamer then emphasized the need for care in the preservation of those documents that have escaped the carelessness of the past, and the necessity of making provision for handling the documents of the future. After the dinner and address, the members of the Association were delightfully guided through the Cabildo museums by James J. A. Fortier.

In that same building was held the conference of historical agencies, scheduled for Saturday morning. C. C. Crittenden of the North Carolina Historical Commission presided over the discussion. Reports were made

on three states, and in all three there were encouraging evidences that antiquarianism and undue emphasis on genealogy were giving way before modern historical scholarship. In his report on the historical agencies of Virginia, Lester J. Cappon of the University of Virginia showed that the lethargy which had marked the earlier historical agencies and activities was dispelled in the 1920's. The Virginia State Library, the University of Virginia, the College of William and Mary, the Virginia Historical Society, and two religious establishments, the Episcopal Diocese of Virginia and the Baptist Historical Society, have made great advances in collecting and making accessible manuscript and printed materials. In South Carolina, reported Anne King Gregorie of the Historical Records Survey, there are nine existing historical agencies. Four of these are county historical societies, one is a city commission of Charleston, and the remaining four are state-wide agencies—the South Carolina Historical Society, the Historical Commission of the state, the South Carolina Historical Association, established in 1930, and the University of South Caroliniana Society, established in 1936 for the purpose of building up the South Carolina collection of the state university. E. W. Winkler of the University of Texas described the growth of interest in historical agencies since 1850. By 1900 three important agencies had been established, the State Library, the Department of History of the University of Texas, and the Texas State Historical Association. All three have done fine work in collecting, preserving, and making accessible historical documents. Since 1920 four regional associations have been established. Their work is based on sound principles and is carried on by trained men. In the discussion that followed these reports it became apparent that the same encouraging developments are found in other states as well.

At another meeting Saturday morning the contributions of some Southern historians and economists were discussed. J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton of the University of North Carolina presided over this session. O. C. Skipper of The Citadel read a paper, "J. D. B. De Bow and the Seventh Census." Mr. Skipper attempted on the basis of available evidence to determine De Bow's part in the final form of the census. He is entitled

to a large share of the credit for the ideas embraced in the schedules adopted for the collection of data, although it cannot be said with certainty that others of the Census Board may not have had somewhat the same ideas. A good deal of the actual compilation had already been done before De Bow took office, but he did make some improvements in the arrangement of the tables, and himself prepared an adequate introduction, suggestive notes, and a useful appendix. He introduced the work of specialists and prepared the *Folio* for publication. The *Compendium* is superior to the *Folio,* but the third volume, the first mortality report attempted, is the least satisfactory of the three. For its weaknesses, however, De Bow is not responsible. On the whole, concluded Mr. Skipper, De Bow is entitled to a great deal of the credit for making the Seventh Census the first modern census.

William C. Binkley read an analysis of the contribution to Southern historical scholarship made by Walter Lynwood Fleming. As a writer, Fleming in his studies of the Civil War and Reconstruction set an example of careful scholarship, objectivity of treatment, and able synthesis. As a teacher, he chose to remain in the South, where he inspired many students to begin and continue research. As an administrator, he was especially active in the movement to develop centers of graduate study in the South. In these three fields Fleming strongly influenced Southern scholarship.

Fred C. Cole of Louisiana State University read for Fred Landon of the University of Western Ontario his paper on Ulrich Bonnell Phillips. The paper dealt particularly with the man himself as he was known to his friends and students. His human qualities materially affected his attitudes toward history; in the familiar correspondence of obscure persons he often found much more that he considered trustworthy than in the public statements of important figures. The paper gave interesting glimpses of the personal side of a man who received the deep affection of many who knew him.

The final session of the Association was held at the St. Charles Hotel at twelve-thirty. After luncheon the closing business meeting was called to order by President Hamer. Reports from officers were read, an

amendment to the constitution of the Association was adopted, and officers for 1939 were elected.

The meeting was officially adjourned, but two events held many of the members in New Orleans until late afternoon. Mr. Parsons received many of the members at his home, where he exhibited his collection of Louisiana material, and others accepted Mack Swearingen's invitation to visit a sugar mill and some of the sugar plantations along the river.

Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer

By FLETCHER M. GREEN

During the year just passed[1] the ordinary activities of the Association have proceeded in a happy and agreeable manner. The officials and committees have performed their duties most satisfactorily, some of them under most trying circumstances. I wish to express my thanks in particular to Herbert A. Kellar and Mack Swearingen and their committees: to Mr. Kellar for his untiring courtesy and assistance in getting the materials for the printed program in shape; and to Professor Swearingen for making the local arrangements, in the midst of his removal from New Orleans to Milledgeville, Georgia, for one of the most pleasant annual meetings yet held. Stanley C. Arthur and Edwin A. Leland, Jr., ably completed the work begun by Professor Swearingen. Without the many courtesies and cordial co-operation of all these gentlemen the Secretary could not possibly have printed the program in time to get it in the hands of the members of the Association.

The Association owes much to Wendell H. Stephenson, who so ably edits the *Journal of Southern History*. The *Journal* alone keeps the Association going and it has annually increased in prestige and value to the historical profession. More and more the university libraries are recognizing it as one of the journals which must be found on their shelves. Professor Stephenson is largely responsible for the merit of the *Journal*.

The executive council, at its meeting held in Durham, North Carolina, on November 20, 1937, considered the matter of having one session of the annual program devoted to some phase of European history so as to appeal to the historian whose primary interest is not in Southern

[1] The fiscal year ended December 31, 1938.

history. The Secretary was instructed to inform the chairman of the committee on program that the council thought this a wise plan. He did so, and Mr. Kellar asked Wallace E. Caldwell of the University of North Carolina to arrange such a session. Professor Caldwell reported back to Mr. Kellar that, after wide correspondence with men in the European history field, he did not think it feasible for the 1938 meeting but did believe many would be interested for 1939 if notice of such plan were given in the February, 1939, issue of the *Journal of Southern History.*

The Association was again invited to hold a joint session with the American Historical Association at its annual meeting held in December, 1938, at Chicago. Alfred J. Hanna, Dallas Irvine, and Robert D. Meade represented the Association and read papers devoted to the Confederacy period. The Association has also accepted the invitation of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association to hold a joint session with that body at its annual meeting to be held at Memphis, Tennessee, in April, 1939.

The executive council at its meeting held on November 4, 1938, recommended that hereafter the business session be held on Friday of the annual meeting rather than on Saturday as heretofore. It is believed that such a change will secure a larger attendance at the business meeting and thus strengthen the Association by awakening a deeper interest in its activities on the part of the membership. The council elected W. Neil Franklin of The National Archives and Walter B. Posey of Birmingham-Southern College to the board of editors of the *Journal of Southern History.* The council also accepted the joint invitation of the University of Kentucky and Transylvania College to hold the 1939 annual meeting in Lexington, Kentucky.

After the Secretary had filed reports of the purposes and financial condition of the Association with the treasury department of the United States, John R. Kirk, deputy commissioner of internal revenue, ruled that the Association was exempt from taxation under the Federal revenue acts as they now stand (letter of July 27, 1938). This ruling permits

members of the Association to deduct annual dues from their Federal income tax returns.

The Secretary has been able to aid the presses of Duke University, the University of North Carolina, the University of Virginia, and the University of Texas during 1938 by furnishing lists of members of the Association to be used in announcing the publication of new books. In accordance with the instructions of the Association, the Secretary transmitted to the Honorable Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, the resolutions introduced by Howard K. Beale and adopted by the Association on November 20, 1937, at Durham, North Carolina. The Secretary of State replied that he would attempt in every way possible the early publication of *Foreign Relations of the United States* (letter of January 10, 1938).

The annual business meeting held at the St. Charles Hotel on November 5, 1938, considered two proposed amendments to the constitution concerning the election of president and vice-president. After considerable debate it was voted to substitute the following for the present Article V: "The officers shall be a president, a vice-president, and a secretary-treasurer. The vice-president shall succeed to the presidency. Other officers shall be elected at each annual meeting as prescribed in the by-laws, and shall hold office for one year or until their successors are qualified." The business meeting elected the following officers for 1939: president, Charles S. Sydnor; vice-president, Frank L. Owsley; secretary-treasurer, Fletcher M. Green; executive council, Kathryn T. Abbey and Avery O. Craven.

The Association has had a fairly satisfactory growth in membership during the year. Full credit should be given to Professor Posey and his committee, one of whom sent in members from five states besides his own. There have been added 144 new members since January 1, 1938. The Association has lost 7 members by death. These were: William K. Boyd of Duke University, George B. Winton of Vanderbilt University, Colonel Henry H. Glassie, U. S. A., of Chevy Chase, Maryland, Captain Samuel A. Ashe, C. S. A., of Raleigh, North Carolina, David C. Bram-

lette of Woodville, Mississippi, Hunter McDonald of Nashville, Tennessee, and Mrs. Wood Spiller of Hammond, Louisiana. Twenty-three members were dropped from the mailing list for nonpayment of dues, but 2 were later restored; and 23 members have resigned. One active member was transferred to the exchange list. The loss, therefore, has been 52 as against 144 new members. This gives a net gain of 92, and a total active membership of 740 including 4 life members. Of the 740 members, 29 are in arrears for 1938 dues. There are 64 exchange members. This gives a grand total of 804 members. The number one year ago was 710.

The Association has members in 46 states, the District of Columbia, the Territory of Hawaii, Argentina, Canada, England, and France. Twenty-three states have 10 or more members. In order of numbers they are: North Carolina 71, Louisiana 69, Virginia 57, Georgia 50, Alabama 45, Mississippi 44, Florida 43, Tennessee 43, Texas 40, District of Columbia 36, Kentucky 33, South Carolina 32, New York 27, Illinois 17, Pennsylvania 16, Indiana 15, Arkansas 14, Maryland 13, Massachusetts 13, Oklahoma 12, West Virginia 12, Ohio 11, and California 10.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1938

RECEIPTS: January 1 to December 31, 1938		
Cash balance, January 1, 1938	$3,942.87	
Profits of New Orleans meeting	10.88	
Interest on savings deposit	72.80	
Advertising in *Journal*	40.00	
Payment of dues	2,269.17	
Total		$6,335.72
DISBURSEMENTS: January 1 to December 31, 1938		
Printing the February and May issues of the *Journal of Southern History*	1,110.00	
Printing programs, membership blanks, receipts, statements for dues, folders for membership committee, and stationery for president and secretary	98.80	
Expenses of membership committee	27.41	
Typing	6.80	
Mimeographing membership list	13.75	

Telegrams	3.75	
Mailing programs	12.00	
Express (literature to membership committee)	2.36	
Supplies (filing case, cash books, etc.)	4.15	
Notary public fees	3.75	
Bad checks returned	6.00	
Refund on overpaid account	2.70	
Postage	44.68	
Total		$1,336.15
Balance as of December 31, 1938		$4,999.57
BALANCE DISTRIBUTED AS FOLLOWS:		
Checking account, Bank of Chapel Hill	$2,033.07	
Savings account, Bank of Chapel Hill	2,966.50	
Total		$4,999.57

Respectfully submitted,

FLETCHER M. GREEN, *Secretary-Treasurer*

Constitution and By-Laws of the Southern Historical Association

CONSTITUTION

I.

The name of this organization shall be The Southern Historical Association.

II.

Its purpose shall be the encouragement of the study of history in the South, with particular emphasis on the history of the South.

III.

All persons who are interested in promoting the purposes of this Association are eligible for membership therein.

IV.

The Association shall hold one annual meeting and such other meetings as the council may call.

V.

The officers shall be a president, a vice-president, and a secretary-treasurer. The vice-president shall succeed to the presidency. Other officers shall be elected at each annual meeting as provided in the by-laws, and shall hold office for one year or until their successors are qualified.[1]

VI.

There shall be an executive council consisting of the president, the vice-president, the secretary-treasurer, the managing editor of *The Journal of Southern History,* ex-presidents for a period of three years following the expiration of their terms of office, and six additional members, two of whom shall be elected at each annual meeting for a term of service of three years each.

VII.

The duties of the council shall be to: (1) decide upon the time and place of the annual meeting of the Association, and to call such other meetings as it may think advisable; (2) appoint the managing editor and the board of editors of *The Journal of Southern History;* (3) fill vacancies which may occur in any office until the beginning of the next calendar year; (4) prepare a budget and handle the business of the Association; (5) formulate and propose to the Association plans for carrying its purposes into effect.

VIII.

The constitution and by-laws may be amended by a vote of two thirds of the members present and voting at the annual business meeting. Any proposed amendment shall be submitted to the secretary-treasurer and must be sent by him to the members with the notice of the annual meeting.

[1] Adopted November 5, 1938, as a substitute for the original Article V.

BY-LAWS

I.

The annual dues of the Association shall be $3.00. Upon payment of $50.00 any person may become a life member, exempt from the payment of further dues.

II.

The fiscal year shall begin on January 1. Terms of office shall begin on the first of January following regular election.

III.

Elections shall be by ballot at the business session of each annual meeting. Nominations shall be made by a nominating committee and may be made by any member from the floor.

IV.

The president shall appoint annually a committee on program, a committee on nominations, a committee on membership, and such other committees as the council or Association shall authorize. The committee on nominations shall consist of five members, one of whom shall serve a second year and be chairman of the committee his second year.[2]

V

The official organ of the Association shall be *The Journal of Southern History*, which shall be distributed to all members. The policies of the *Journal* shall be determined by the managing editor and the board of editors, eight in number. Members of the board of editors shall serve four years, two to be chosen each year.

VI.

A quorum shall consist of fifteen members.

[2] The amendment regarding the committee on nominations was adopted November 20, 1937.

Notes and Documents

The John Tobler Manuscripts: An Account of German-Swiss Emigrants in South Carolina, 1737

Edited by Charles G. Cordle

John Tobler, the author of these papers, had been governor (*Landeshaubtmann* in the manuscripts) of the Ausser Rhoden portion of the Swiss canton of Appenzell. Being deposed in consequence of the struggle, 1732-1735, between the Zellwegers and the Wetters, or the *Linden* and the *Harten,* he left the country in disgust and, together with one Sebastian Zuberbuehler, led a group of Swiss to Carolina. Many of these emigrants settled near Savannah Town in the township of New Windsor, in what is now the Beech Island section of South Carolina, only a few miles from Augusta, Georgia.[1] They were supposed to be followed by a still greater number; and throughout these papers the author shows much concern for those who were to come later. In 1754 and in later years Tobler published a Carolina almanac, copies of which are preserved by the Charleston Library Society. He died April 19, 1765.[2]

The Tobler manuscripts, comprising a letter of March 18, 1737, and a portion of Tobler's diary, from February 11 to March 18, 1737, and copied by two different hands in German script, are preserved in the archives at Trogen, Canton Appenzell. The editor learned of their existence through Frau Bruckner-Thiersch of Basel, whose nephew works

[1] For further information about this colony, see Gilbert T. Voigt, *The German and German-Swiss Element in South Carolina, 1732-1752,* University of South Carolina *Bulletin,* No. 113 (Columbia, 1922), 17-18, 19-20, 31-33, 44-51.

[2] *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (Charleston, 1900-), X (1909), 162, quoting records kept by Colonel Isaac Hayne.

in the *Staatsarchiv* there; and he secured photostat copies through the kindness of Herr Ratschreiber Buchmann of St. Gallen. Besides abbreviations and omissions the papers have many archaic and provincial expressions which make translation difficult. Words and phrases which the translators[3] have been unable to render into English have been copied and italicized. In places the word order has been changed for smoothness, and the punctuation has been modernized. Also lengthy sentences have been divided into component parts to make the meaning clear. For lack of space in this article many parts dealing with family matters, greetings, discussion of the weather, and the like have been omitted.

In the letter written from "Carlestown" and addressed to relatives and friends in Switzerland, Tobler stated that the party sailed from Falmouth December 5 and landed in Carolina on February 1; and that of more than two hundred people on board only four persons died during the voyage. With the idea of encouraging emigration to Carolina, he added that there was need for skilled laborers such as carpenters, gunsmiths, and the like. He requested his friends to send him roofing nails and other supplies, and recommended that newcomers should bring linen garments, good muskets, piece goods, whetstones, scythes and sickles, all kinds of seeds, copper vessels, lead, and gunpowder. The letter continued:

A pastor in this land has yearly from the government 500 lb. & a fine estate near the town. He must, however, be ordained in London in the presence of the bishop; and there must be in addition a hundred heads of families. There are already some villages begun with people, but few that have enough heads of families for a benefice. In Orangeburg they would like to have more people in order that there might be a benefice. When you write to me, the place where [I] intend to live is called Savaneton; & [I] can be addressed at Carleston [his spelling] in care of the German printer "To Mr. Lewis Timothy," which gentleman promised me to send the goods. . . . Whatever else concerns me, I am not sorry that I have traveled hither; but I am sorry that I did not travel four or five years earlier so that I might have overcome the hard beginning that [I] now have before me. . . .

Below Savaneton, whither with the help of God we shall move, there is much

[3] The editor was assisted in making the translation by Mrs. Cordle and by Mr. and Mrs. George Steffan, both natives of Austria. Mrs. Steffan is head of the department of modern languages at Payne College, Augusta, Georgia.

good land; and if you do not come, strangers will take it away, which in future years can no longer be prevented. . . .

Tobler added greetings to friends in Switzerland and gave directions for sending the globes, books, and other articles that he had ordered.

The following fragment of Governor Tobler's diary was dated at "Charlestown," March 18, 1737.

Friday the 11th February . . . to-day the group requested have come to a friendly agreement and arranged to go to Port royal.

Saturday the 12th . . . to-day the 22 persons (but only 5 Appenzellers) left for Portroyal to guard that fortress. The people from Puenden [Graubuenden?] have all gone for the reason that they, like others, used up their money on the journey and again hope to earn much, because twelve pounds and rations every week have been promised them *p*[4] They had to swear an oath to consider the present king in England the rightful king, and not the Pretender nor another Catholic king. Hereafter when they come back, they shall be able to go where they desire in the whole land according to their pleasure, and in all things [be] regarded as if they were Englishmen themselves. . . .

Sunday the 13th . . . in the afternoon the shoemaker Bruderer from Gaeiss came and brought news from my father and son, that they [are] both vigorous and healthy and advise me to come to them, because the land [is] very good, and if I do not like it, [I] should plant his land with my servants and then inquire and afterwards go (into) the land where I will. But because there was no longer enough good land for the whole people, and I did not doubt many more people would come later who would like to live among us, for the people's sake [I] did not accept but decided to remain with them, where they and I consider best. . . .

Monday the 14th . . . to-day the people were assembled and decided to inspect three places and then together to choose which place they like best, namely Amelia or the English Sante [*sic*], Gangre [Congaree?] and Savanaton;[5] and [it] is arranged [that] "Mr." Glaser, Schelling from the Rheinthal, Melchior

[4] This symbol *p* appears very frequently in parts of the manuscripts. Since the translators were unable to learn its meaning (it appears to indicate a pause of some kind), they have omitted it elsewhere.

[5] Amelia was a township on the Santee River. Congaree was located about the head of the Santee, near the present site of Columbia. Savanaton, or Savannah Town, was a trading post located near the Carolina end of the present-day Sand Bar Ferry Bridge, about four miles from Augusta. There Fort Moore had been erected before 1719 to protect the traders and to guard the frontier. To Savannah Town there was a trail from Charles Town, which was in general followed by the railroad from Charleston to Hamburg and Augusta about a century later. Edward McCrady, *The History of South Carolina under the Proprietary Government, 1670-1719* (New York, 1897), 639; *id., The History of South Carolina under the Royal Government, 1719-1776* (New York, 1901), 299-300, 639, 703.

Liechtertage, Hans Kruese and I [in the manuscript the sentence is not completed; the writer of the original probably said that these men were named as a committee to inspect the three possible sites for a settlement]. It has been further decided that all shall enjoy like privileges, and that no one (if Savanaton is chosen) may join us if the majority does not want him, lest all kinds of people must be received whom we do not like and who would only cause us strife. In addition we promised to hold together; and if one or the other does not care to remain with the company, then he is at liberty [to go], but should afterwards be regarded as a stranger if he proposes to go away.

Tuesday the 15th . . . to-day we informed the "Commissari" of our intention, who said that "Provision" had already been sent to Savanatown for us; and if we wished to inspect the places, it would require several weeks' time, so that we could plant nothing more this year. The people were again assembled and decided that the men should go in a body to Savanaton in order to inspect this place. If they liked this place, they could begin to work and have women, children and baggage follow on the river; if not, [they could] have the privilege like others of going away again to choose another pleasing location. The other 2 points with regard to equality of privileges and reception of strangers were unanimously ratified. Those persons who were not willing to agree to these things [but chose] to go elsewhere are Mr. Giezetanner, Hans Jacob Giger and his sons, as also Abraham Giger.[6]

Wednesday the 16th . . . the Gouverneur was unwilling to let those go who did not want to remain with the company, because [he said] this place was one of the best and was chosen "expresse" for us; consequently it was not advisable to choose something else at great cost and loss of much time, especially since it was already late to plant. In the meantime Mr. Giezedanner and his adherents, however, began a great uproar and asserted they were betrayed because they were not permitted to go where they wished, and [said] if they cultivated the land, they would have to go away again, and told more lies; and although they railed at the pastor [Zuberbuehler] and not at me, yet it is not right to spread such lies. Because a seal and letters are given that (if) the land is allotted, then it is one's property, so that even the king himself can offer no objection. Ten years [one] is exempt [from taxes]; and then one pays yearly on 100 acres no more than 1 florin 30 Kreuzer in your money, which [I have] heard from reliable people. In the evening many determined that they did not want to dwell near Mr. Giezedanner and his adherent, because they had already caused so much strife on the journey, and nothing else [was] to be expected than that they would continue it;

[6] Giezetanner, sometimes Giezedanner, was perhaps John Giessendanner, later prominent in the Orangeburg settlement, whose uncle, John Ulrich Giessendanner, was pastor of the Switzers who in 1735 formed a settlement in Orangeburg Township. In 1742 Abram Giger, Herman Gyger, and Hans Jac. Gyger received grants of land in Saxe-Gotha, or Congaree. Voigt, *German and German-Swiss Element in South Carolina,* 56.

therefore they would rather live without him and in peace. [They said] they now had good reason because he had himself decided to leave us. It might also happen as at Graffentel, when he also declared he would not travel with us and nevertheless remained with us without any persuasion. Besides we knew what a useless man Herman Giger was, how he swore and cursed. They can also do without his father and cousin.

Thursday the 17th . . . to-day a place Fridrichsburg[7] was allotted to the people from the Rheinthal (except Felix Riz). Thither they will move tomorrow. This place is located to the north on a river that flows into the Sante but is not open [free from obstructions], so that one can sail only with small craft into the right river. [It] is therefore false, as they yesterday alleged, that one is betrayed who goes there. Mr. Giezedanner, who is left with them as the headman, did not go with them. Our party is glad because almost [all] those have gone whom they gladly bade go, except [that] we should have liked to keep old Schelling. [It] is therefore better [that] they have gone pleasantly than if we had got rid of them otherwise, because they caused us only embarrassment, especially Mr. Giezetanner, who cannot endure the church and the ministry, and [in] the whole matter has been an intriguer against the pastor. As they previously thought, I should go with them; but I choose rather to inspect the place chosen by Mr. Zuberbuehler and then go at will to this or another place, since I, of course, consider not only myself, but I should like to choose a place where not only this company but also those coming later might get good land, as I am minded not to rest until [I have] found such a place. You, however, who have a desire to come in here, guard against all kinds of people whom you do not know. We had people in our ship who were as maliciously angry at all the Appenzellers as I have seen in my whole life. Because, however, they, praise God, [are gone] from us, I shall not name them. If Mr. Vorbuirger goes with you, receive him and his company with joy because he is a Christian and no fighter [and] will also guard against such people who love only quarrel and strife. Should people be with you whom you call Pietists, test them well, for all is not gold that glitters . . . . However, they are not all to be shunned; and here in this place they can hold publicly their teachings and meetings if they [are] according to the Holy Scriptures. We also like them well if they, like others, help to found churches and schools, live according to the word of God as much as is possible, do not scorn the pastor when he teaches according to God's word, also do not always rail in their teachings only against the church and declaim passionately against the people who go in it.

Friday the 18th . . . in the morning we went before the "Commissari" and had to take an oath for so long as we remain in the land, that we respect and regard the present king in England as the legitimate one, also his princes and

[7] Fridrichsburg was a township on the Wateree River, perhaps near the present site of Camden.

princesses as the legitimate successors, and not the Pretender or another Catholic king; also against the pope and invocation of the saints, as also with regard to the Holy Supper, that bread and wine are established symbols and that no transubstantiation takes place. [We] would be permitted to go in the whole land where we pleased, and if we wished, to go out again. The land that is given us is 50 acres a head, for us and our posterity's property. We might sell it, exchange it, in fact dispose of it at will as with our property. We enjoy every right, like born Englishmen. In fact, [he said] in all things there shall be no difference between us and the Englishmen. They give us a certain quantity of provisions for a year, as also implements and cattle; and [we] have to give nothing in return except we must return to the servants the provisions that we [received] for the service years, when their service years are up and they receive their own land. They give us a guide to the place as also expenses above the yearly. Wife, children and baggage will be brought to us afterwards by water as soon as we have declared where we wish to remain. Those coming later are relieved of such trouble; if they only say they want to come to us, they will soon be escorted themselves to that place. To-day at nine o'clock a decreasing eclipse of about 5 inches was seen here through the mist. With you it probably took place in the afternoon.

Saturday the 19th . . . . This morning the people from the Rheinthal set out for Fridrichsburg. Their leader was the shoemaker from Gaeiss. The "Commissari" distributed some implements and "Provision" on account and promised to give us on Monday morning a guide to show us the way to Savaneton. . . . Glaser has been persuaded to remain with us and to go with us to Savanaton to inspect that place.

Sunday the 20th . . . a divine service was held by the pastor in the French church, and Cunrad Ouzster's daughter was christened. Yesterday "provision" was given to the people on account; and it amounts for one person above 12 years (below that 2 count as 1) to 350 lb. of meat (the English pound here is 32 half-ounces), 200 lb. of rice, 1 bushel of salt and 8 bushels of corn (1 bushel is not less than 2 quarters with you). 30 head have an iron hand mill; and 3 head have one cow, 1 calf, 1 pig. They also give to a male person over 12 years 2 mattocks and an axe, also in general grindstones and wood saws, according to the size of the company. To-day [I] traveled 6 miles (an English mile is 2000 paces, as [I] myself measured to-day; one must therefore run hard if one wants to run three miles in one hour; it is known that 4 English [miles] make 1 German) into the country and found at first poor land, where only pines [*Fohr*] or Scotch pines [*Daehlen*[8]] grow. The farther, however, one comes from Carlstown, the better land one finds; yet up to this place [I] have

[8] By *Daehlen* is meant the longleaf pine, to which Tobler gave the name of a European tree.

always found sandy land . . . . To-day I was asked to give 40 lb. for a strong but not fine 8 year old horse and believe that I shall take it to-morrow, because I find it hard to travel 150 miles on foot, and especially because [I] want to take along my daughter and a maid, who cannot walk all the time either. A fine outfit for horseback riding without cloak and boots recently cost me 40 lb.; yet saddle blanket and pistol holsters could not be made so neatly with you. In short, everything here is very high, partly because too many people arrive, the transportation, on the other hand, [is] too great, and the skilled workers [are] too few. Good artisans can here earn their piece of bread and much more besides, as I have myself met some who, because they could not pay their passage over sea, were sold as servants for 4 years and now live in great wealth. There is here a German tailor who himself told me that in one year he can earn 1000 lb., and his bought servants have to do almost all work. Otherwise, everything here is overcrowded with negroes, who as slaves do nearly all [the] work. [They] appear, however, very wild and roguish; and [I] could not believe anything good of them. They bear very many children, who must also serve as slaves their whole lives. According to my way of thinking, they live like cattle. In short, I do not like them, although they do one not the least harm nor dare to because it is forbidden under heavy penalties.

Monday the 21st . . . on this day at 11 o'clock our 25 persons began, in God's name, the journey to Savaneton; and after we had traveled about 15 miles, we remained in the wood over night, where we slept as securely as with you in a closed room, because everywhere [there is] surplus wood to make fire and to sleep around it. Therefore every night we made 2 or 3 big fires the whole night to cook, to warm ourselves (because the nights [are] still cold) and to sleep around.

Tuesday the 22nd . . . we found much good [land] but also poor land near by, which latter was sandy, also briars and bushes here and there, as also fine "plantations" ([they] are country estates) with blooming peach trees. In the morning some came into a house, where they got food and drink for nothing. Noon we came to Dortstetten [Dorchester?], a pretty good place on a navigable stream and only 25 miles from Carlstown. There a town is supposed to be built. There are also many houses there already. The people are indeed friendly; but if one wants to buy something, and they see that one must necessarily have it, they overcharge their goods very much, as we saw [in the case of] two horses, which were overcharged more than half; and yet they rarely haggle about the price of anything. We again remained over night in the forest near a poor plantation.

Wednesday the 23d . . . yesterday evening Jno. Iller and Hs. Naegele got lost in the wood through imprudence and remained over night on a good plantation. Glaser and our guide sought them, and the latter found [them] because they went back where they had been yesterday evening. . . . Afterwards we continued our journey, and soon a snake about 4 feet long was killed by Hans

Kruesti with a small stick. At 1 o'clock we came to the Ediston [Edisto] River to a house, where we not only got provisions for 4 days, but the master of the house gave me and my daughter Elssbeth very good food. We ate bread from maize, which was very good and almost snow white. . . . This river is not so large as the Rhine at Rheinegg. After we swam the horses across the river and carried our goods across, we traveled a mile farther to a plantation and remained in the forest. The man, however, was unwilling to leave me and three other persons in the forest but urged us to come to his house, fed us very well and assigned us beds for sleeping. These were Glaser, Gabriel and my daughter.

Thursday the 24th it began to rain in the night; therefore the people came to us early in the morning, to whom also quarters were given. Because it rained the whole day, we remained there.

Friday the 25th . . . the man in the house still fed us and was very unwilling to let us go, and much less to take money from us. Because we, however, were very eager to finish our journey as quickly as possible, we nevertheless left this place because it seemed as if the rainy weather would stop; and we found now bad, now good land. The *Daehlen* (which [is] a kind of pine), which yield the most wood, are the finest and tallest timber that I [have] seen in my lifetime. . . . There are also genuine pines [*Fohren*], which, however, [have] not such fine timber as the *Daehlen*. . . . The cypresses are still finer, of which [there are] very many. In short, a genuine lover of building does not yet know where to look because Carolina is a continuous forest.

Saturday the 26th . . . the people had to wade at times up to the *hosenband* [garter or belt]. In the evening we came to a hut, where [there was] a plantation, where we could cook, sleep and warm ourselves. There was no one there but two couples of married people, a savage and a negro or slave couple, and a negro child. Almost every day we saw stags. In the evening we ate venison, which the savage furnished us very cheap. . . .

Sunday the 27th . . . at 11 o'clock we set out and under continuous rain came at 3 o'clock 11 miles distant to M[onsieur] Golche's plantation, which is situated by the road on the right. This man is an inn-keeper and is ashamed to sell his goods very high to traveling people. Here is half way between Carlstown and Savaneton.

Monday the 28th . . . the "Commissari" in Carlston directed us to take here "Provision" [to last] to Savaneton because [he said] nothing more was to be had up to that place. But this man did not respect the "Commissari's" writing and would furnish us nothing except very dear and for our money. We had to take it as a favor that he had given the people for 4 lb. a steer that was cut 4 days before and was nothing but blue flesh and bone under the skin, and to Gabriel and me a good little pig (which [was] not high-priced) for 3 lb., and a bushel of corn or peas for 2 lb., a bottle of rum for 12½ shillings. At Carlstown one can get more than 4 for that price; and if one buys much, one can get

better at 10 shillings a pail [gallon] (is 4 bottles), which is about 4 St. Gallen quarts. To be sure, we might still have had quarters to remain there; but nevertheless in the evening at 5 o'clock we traveled 4 or 5 miles more into the forest to spend the night there, where we rested better than in the house.

Tuesday the 1st March . . . [we] traveled over much good land. There was so much dried up grass to be found in the woods that [it was] easy to conclude that in many places here in the woods more grass grows than in the best fields with you. This grass is often set on fire by the travelers and savages in the spring in order not only to check the insect pests, but so that new grass should grow for the cattle and the travelers' horses. . . . In this land everybody travels on horseback (even the slaves), which also [is] best and costs the least because one can soon come far and easily across the streams because [there are] yet few dry and good wide roads. [They] are, however, to be made up to Savanetown, as already there is such a road up to 50 miles, which [is] at least 3 wagons wide and straight as a line, so that one can see through the forest very far behind and before him. . . .

Wednesday the 2nd . . . after we had traveled a mile or two, we came to a wretched plantation, where there was only a single man. Also there was little cleared land there. Yesterday & to-day we saw very large whitish gray birds (larger than geese). We found much burnt off grass, which had come out again beautifully green & was very good for the horses. In the afternoon the land became at first mountainlike, which [was] gradually rising upward, then level, & again gradually sloping downward, then again level. For the most part, however, the valleys are spongy with water, especially at this time, because this week there has been a high water. This afternoon for the first time we found swamps, so that the horses in places could not easily get through, as I then drowned my shoes while riding not in the water but in the swamp.

Thursday the 3d the land became even more mountainlike & now and then very poor & sandy. This day we found very many nut trees, which, however, were sharp cornered and *grueblicht* [pitted?], which I suppose comes because the trees are not tended, for they appear very wild. . . . After 10 miles we came to a 3 branched body of water, which came up on the horses as far as the saddles. Afterwards we found no more water at all for 10 miles but only burning grass in the woods. Afterwards we again found an equally deep [stream]. There we rested & ate dinner rather late. Afterwards we traveled 11 more miles and arrived very happily in Savaneton at 7 o'clock in the evening, without the guide, because a part of the people could not follow, so we left them in the morning with the guide, & by degrees continued our journey. We came to the house of a merchant, who fed us and gave us quarters for sleeping.

Friday the 4th . . . we asked for a man who might show us the land that Mr. Zuberbuehler chose for the people from Appenzell; but because the water was so high this week that many cattle & swine were drowned in the swamp, they post-

poned the matter until to-morrow, because there was a body of water in between, that one could not readily pass through with the horses. This, however, was above Savaneton. The merchant assigned us two houses to live in. At twelve o'clock noon came the people, who were quartered in the one house. The Savana River passes by near this place & is about as large as the Rhine at Rheineck. It is said, in fact, to have many fish; [I] have, however, not seen any, although [I] stood by the river. Moreover, Savaneton is located on high ground; indeed, in places the bank is almost as high as a church tower. There is a fort[9] here with 14 men, where there are also 20 to 30 little houses built. [As for] trees, [I] have seen none here but peachtrees, which [are] very thick with blooms. As I wrote this, the king of the savages, beside 4 others, stood beside me. They looked at me very sharply, also showed the treaty of peace which they had made with the king in England; and after they had shown other signs of friendship and love from themselves, they bowed, offered me their hands & took a courteous leave. They painted themselves strangely with red color. The king wore a beautiful brass breastpiece over his heart. Besides, the people here are very friendly & do whatever they can to please us.

Saturday the 5th . . . [I] was supposed to go to the fort for breakfast; but because I intended to inspect the land, [I] excused myself; & at 10 o'clock there came 2 guides, one of whom spoke German. With them we traveled several miles above [Savaneton] toward the north. There, to be sure, we looked at pretty good land but not yet pleasing to us & too far from the river. [We] said therefore that we did not like it; & if no better land & [land] by the river [was] to be found, [we] would go back again to other places. Because, however, they were not willing to let us go, they traveled with us below Savaneton (the people on foot could not follow). As soon as we were 3 or 4 miles from the river, we were already seeing better land; and soon it appeared good enough to us. It was almost nothing but wood with leaves of oak and nut trees, & only a few pines near the river. Far from it there are enough of them all right. Beside them are very many wild grape vines, which gives us hope of planting there good grape vines. There are also blooming peachtrees there. Indeed, without doubt all kinds of fruit-bearing trees would thrive well there if one only had stones and kernels of all kinds of fine fruits. The guide informed us that there is such good land down the river for 30 miles and up on the other side for 12 miles, which is also credible because, so far as we have seen, we have seen nothing but good land. Therefore [there is] land enough for some 100 persons by a beautiful navigable river. The land is not very level, but at first a little sloping & mountainlike, but by far not as above Savaneton, where it is almost as mountainous (but not so high) as in Switzerland. Here are good grasses; & because the land [is] high, the air appears healthy to me. Indeed, it is at or on the

[9] Fort Moore.

sources of the mountains, so that above [is] mountain & below plain. The inclement weather has hindered us from investigating the matter further; only we have not forgotten to observe that in places the bank [is] pretty high & gradually rises the farther one goes from the river. There are still some poor huts there, which I suppose the savages formerly made, now, however, abandoned. [It] may be also that the Christians come and either die or otherwise abandon them. But they may be made by whom they will, this great tract of land belongs to us & those following, because only one person has had land apportioned there, so that consequently we are the first except for him. [We] wish only that those who have a desire to come here should not delay long, lest strangers be before them, as people are always arriving who are eager for good land, especially if people are already there, for much good land in one tract by beautiful navigable rivers is beginning therefore to become scarce. [I] advise you therefore if you indeed wish to join us, not to travel so late as we, because this year we are almost too late for planting. This place is situated in north latitude 33½ degrees & is situated 81½ degrees to the west of London (15 degrees make one hour; therefore day [comes] 5 hours 26 minutes later than at London in England, and from London to Switzerland [one] finds also about 50 minutes [difference]). As this was revealed to those people who waited in Savaneton, they thanked God & unanimously determined to remain there, which delighted the people of Savaneton; and [they] promised to give the people "provision." [I] ate 2 or 3 times at a gentleman's house with several persons & was supposed to go to several places but had no time; & yet they would take nothing for it but gave us more bread for the way; & one offered & requested [me] to leave my daughter at his house until I came back, which [I] left to my daughter's choice. . . .

Sunday the 6th . . . because now those who showed us the way to Savaneton wanted to travel to Orangeburg, we decided (because I wanted besides to go to my father's) to go along. At 1 o'clock in the afternoon we set out on the journey in the name of God; & after we traveled 11 miles, we came again to that body of water passed on Thursday, & after 10 miles to the 3 branched [stream], all of which came up to the saddles of the horses, after 3 miles to another, where we remained over night. It was a very cold wind and bright. This day the savages brought the merchant in Savaneton buffalo, bear & deer hides very cheaply, in fact, even a leather boat, which can be folded up & carried easily, & afterwards 4 or 5 persons can travel in it across the rivers. Indeed they bring those people meat of all kinds of game & of most beautiful birds for a very low price.

Monday the 7th . . . after we had traveled 11 miles, we arrived at a new plantation by the road on the right. The man gave us something to eat. We arrived there at 9 o'clock & saw in front of the house about a half target shot away 6 wild cocks or Indian [birds, turkeys]. The man shot at one; and although he was close by, yet he missed it. We saw them almost every day, &

indeed many, especially on the return journey. After about 2 hours we left; and because our guide's horse could no longer go well, we had to remain at 4 o'clock in the evening at a wretched plantation. There were 3 persons present, who, however, did not all belong here, because on the journey from Carleston only one man [was] there. [We] had met one man & the woman at "Mr." Golcher's as people traveling to Savaneton.

Tuesday the 8th we had to wait until 7 o'clock & still set out without the guide. They told us that 5 or 6 miles more a little road went to the left, & we should take it. As we had now traveled so far, we looked for the road a long time, rode back & forth, but could not find any. They themselves did not know it, because we afterwards learned that 10 or 11 miles more, & not 5 or 6 miles more, a road went to the left. Because we now had hope of finding from Mons. Golcher a way to Orangeburg, we traveled there with all earnestness & arrived there fresh & remained there over night, who received us honorably. [He] told us that there was indeed a road to that place but at this time [there was] too much water, so that we could not get through. We must, however, [he said] go back only 11 miles; there a road to the right would appear, which would bring us to the Ediston River.

Wednesday the 9th we again traveled back in order to come to Orangeburg if possible; & after we had traveled about 11 miles, we found a road to the right, & after about 20 miles on this road a plantation near the river, & indeed near the western arm of Ediston. As we arrived, it began to rain very hard; & after we had given the horses peas which had been presented to us, we wanted to go across the river. It rained as hard as [I have] ever seen; & yet because we feared the river might swell still more after the hard rain, we did not want to miss the time to cross if possible; but the river ran so strongly that we could not bring a horse across, but they hastened with all their might back toward us. For the people it was bad also because the big tree that was felled across it was far under water on the other side, so that we were forced this night to remain over night on this plantation in a little wretched hut. Here is still much good land.

Thursday the 10th we decided to go straightway to Carleston & not to strive against a higher power, because we had not reached our goal these 2 days, since we [were] just as far from Carleston as on Tuesday morning & about 20 miles from Orangeburg. . . . We [were] therefore again at dinner at "Mr." Golcher's, who again made the account good. After we had traveled 11 more miles, we arrived again at the plantation where on the previous journey there were only savages & "Negres." This time "Mr." Kelly himself was there together with 3 other Englishmen, who soon gave us something to eat. We also desired to buy corn for the horses. [He] said, however, that he had little & none to sell. [He] gave some to us, however, for nothing. This was the tallest man that [I have] seen in Carolina; elsewhere also [I have seen] few his equals. He was a good shot & brought home 2 turkeys.

Friday morning the 11th we wanted very much to travel early. Because, however, the latter [Kelly] together with another wanted to travel with us, we had to eat breakfast first. After 8 o'clock we departed & came at 11 o'clock to an old abandoned plantation, 10 miles from the night's quarters. Soon we came to a road that led us to the right to a new road to Carleston. At 1 o'clock we found as good land as [I had] seen. At 2 o'clock we arrived at the plantation of the one who traveled with us. He gave us food & drink & was so kind to us that we were persuaded to remain at his place over night. He has many "Negres" who work, & there is in this place very good but wet land for rice planting. This day we found very much water, which sometimes came on the horses up to the saddles (the little [streams] one pays no attention to) and elsewhere wet enough. The man's name is "Mr." Johann Rieth. . . .

Saturday morning the 12th at 6 o'clock we left the place & at 9½ o'clock came to the Ediston River, where [there is] a ferry for people & cattle. Because, however, others were before us, we had to wait a long time until the others were ferried over; & after we [were] across, we took the new cut road, which [is] 3 wagons wide & so straight that one can see far before & behind him. This road goes to Carleston. We found, however, very much water & mud, so that the horses had very much to do. Today we traveled over much good but low & damp land, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon across a navigable body of water over a bridge. Here we had over 20 miles more, which took the hope from us of coming to Carleston this day. Nevertheless, we came at 6 o'clock to a navigable river by the "ferre," where also there was a ferry, & only 12 miles to Carleston. Therefore we continued the journey with such earnestness that at 10 o'clock in the evening we arrived healthy and happy in Carleston. We left the horses 6 miles outside with the one who had furnished me my horse. . . . The 8 March [a proclamation] was read out that only this year should "Provision" be given to the people, but no longer in the future, which ought to be noted by those who have a desire to come here, that they do not fail to arrive, if possible, this very year.

[I] met here also my son Ulric,[10] who already speaks English well & has grown considerably. . . .

Sunday the 13th a divine service was held by the pastor. I informed the people of my journey & land, who [were] content. Soon, however, [they] would have become homesick if [I] had not come soon, because the Germans here spread all kinds of lies, so that one does not know what to believe until one has seen it himself. [I] gave Glaser 25 lb. in the name of the whole people because he journeyed with us. In the afternoon Glaser departed for Orangeburg, & with him my son to buy cattle & then bring my father along to Savane-

[10] While riding from his father's to Fort Moore on February 15, 1760, Ulric Tobler, then a captain of militia, was slain and scalped by a Cherokee Indian. Charleston *South Carolina Gazette*, February 23, 1760.

ton. There are 80 miles from Orangeburg to Savaneton, & from Orangeburg to Carleston the far & better way 120, the other, however, 80.

Monday the 14th it was still good weather, as yesterday also. Tuesday nothing important happened because the "Commissari" was not here. Moreover I bought to-day much food of peas, flour, rice, cider, rum, sugar & bread. To-day the Zueblins[11] departed for Purisburg.

Tuesday the 15th . . . the "Commissari" has not yet come; therefore we do not know yet when we can depart.

Wednesday the 16th . . . we have not yet been able to locate the "Commissari." His wife conjectures he might have become sick on his plantation. Now he has come & has promised to expedite the matter as quickly as possible.

Thursday the 17th . . . a son was very safely born to Hs. Ulric Frey. Friday 18th [I] traveled 20 miles into the country. . . . This day & Saturday the 19th were summer days. Yesterday [I] stopped at the Gouverneur's on the trip [to see] about suitable land for the construction of a saw mill, & to-day 150 acres have been granted me. . . . As for Carolina, I have myself found thus: that it is a continuous forest of many kinds of fine timber, as the diary shows. In most places, however, the timber does not stand thick because the burnt off grass weakens the young timber & sets fire to much large timber, so that it either dries up & then is again set on fire the next year or is thrown down by the wind, as then many thousand trees lie everywhere & rot, & some burn with the grass. Much is set on fire too by the savages & travelers, so that the timber rather decreases than increases. Except in damp places, where nothing can be set on fire, there stands much very large leafy timber of oaks, also whole patches of cypresses. There is the best rice land, but very hard to clear. Besides, the land is flat far & wide. If one comes far from the sea, it often has little mountains, which are, however, not so steep & high as with you. [I] suppose, however, if one comes still farther from the sea than [I] have been, the mountains will become still higher, as then the description inform[s] that Carolina is separated from New France & florida by high mountains. Besides, the land is well supplied with fine navigable rivers & very many tributaries which flow into the large ones. The water in them is very light & good & does nothing to one however much one drinks, except heed be taken that it would purge if much were drunk. The low places near the sea have bad & unhealthy water. [I] cannot praise them either for healthy air, especially here, which, however, almost all seaports commonly have. The people in general are not so healthy here as they were on the sea. Some of them are, however, themselves to blame because they love the rum, wine & beer too much, which [are] all stronger than with you. They think too the belly must always be full, while newcomers would do

[11] These were three brothers from St. Gallen. David Zueblin (the name was later shortened to Zubly), one of the brothers, was the father of John Joachim Zubly, who migrated to America in 1744, and who was later a famous Savannah preacher and a member of the Continental Congress.

much better if they ate and drank moderately, because they do no work. For my part, [I] can write, praise God, that on the whole journey up to this hour [I have] had no sick hour, have used no medicines either except some just for sick people, & nevertheless drunk now and then a little rum, beer, wine & "ponsch" but not in abundance, but a little as a medicine, while others often fill themselves, so that they suffer injury to their health.

As for the land, whether it be poor or good, [I] have met [it] everywhere & have divided it into 4 parts, while [I have] found a rather small part that is good for nothing but timber growing & a little grass because there [is] too much sand. On this part the finest timber does not grow, but [is] short & crooked; however, there is also fine [timber] among it. The second part I consider as good as if with you one cuts down forests on level ground & then plants, which must be somewhat manured. On this part grows very much grass & fine timber. The third part [I] consider just as good as if you should turn over & then sow your best fields, which at first needs no manuring but in a few years is needed. On this kind of ground there is fine corn 2 or 3 years without any manuring; & afterwards they fence it in, & then they drive the cattle only to spend the night on it, & then it is again as good as in the beginning. On this part very much grass grows; & if it were mown, if it were previously burnt off so that no old [grass] were among it, very good feed could be made for the cattle; & if old [grass] were among it, very good litter could be made, & one could have as much of it as one desired. In these three parts cattle raising could be put on a very good footing if plow land were made out of the fallow ground as with you, & then feed were made for the cattle for about 2 or 3 months, & they were put into the shed. Then they would give milk as well as with you, especially at somewhat elevated places. Indeed, the people say milk & butter are even more delicious than with you. If nothing, however, is given them to eat in the wintertime, they can give nothing. As then with you around [St.] Gall's day, also some days later not much could be expected from the cattle if you would not give them anything nor put them in the shed, as winters here well remind me how it is with you between [St.] Gall's day & St. Martin's day.[12]

The fourth part of the land, which [is] not the smallest but by far the best, has no similarity with your land. It yields for many years without cultivation what is necessary for human life & maintenance, & very richly at that, is, however, hard to cultivate because much large timber of oaks & other kinds of hardwood stands on it. One part is damp & produces very much rice. One part is dry & produces what one desires. But without planting no harvest must be expected, & the splendid fruits which you hope to enjoy here do not grow in forests but on planted places. [It] is therefore a pity that [there are] not industrious people here who would profit by this knowledge, as the Englishmen are nothing for that purpose at all but only for idleness. *p. p.* [and so forth?]

[12] St. Gall's day is October 16; St. Martin's day, November 11.

CYRUS GRIFFIN'S PLAN OF RECONCILIATION WITH THE AMERICAN COLONIES

Edited by HENRY S. RORER

On Saturday, December 30, 1775, "a Solid Sensible young man"[1] from Virginia appeared at the home of the Earl of Dartmouth and asked to see his Lordship. Informed that his Lordship was not receiving visitors, the Virginian departed in disappointment, leaving, however, the following communication for the Earl to read at his leisure:

I have frequently done myself the honour to wait on your Lordship but never so fortunate to have a personal interview. To the humanity of my Lord Dartmouth's disposition it is almost improper to make any apology for submitting the enclosed plan of reconciliation between Great Britain and her Colonies. I am convinced that a plan of this sort is the only way to bring about a happy and permanent accommodation. Nothing can give more uneasiness to an American than the present deplorable situation of his Country in general, of his near connexions and the whole of his little fortune in particular. I hope your Lordship will pardon the freedom I have taken upon this occasion. Indeed the intrusion would be highly impertinent if we were not told from history that the efforts of the most inconsiderable person may sometimes be of the greatest service to the Community.

I have the honour to be

Your Lordship's most obedient humble servant,

CYRUS GRIFFIN.

Grange Court,
Cary Street,
Lincolns Inn.[2]

The Earl of Dartmouth knew only this of Cyrus Griffin: he was a Virginian, and a parishioner of his Lordship's good friend and correspondent, the Reverend Isaac William Gibberne.[3] The Earl might have sup-

[1] Thomas Adams to John M. Jordan and Company of London, October 23, 1770, in *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (Richmond, 1893-), XXIII (1916), 58.

[2] Copy furnished by the Honorable William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth, from original MS. in his files, January 11, 1938. It is not known why Griffin used the Lincoln's Inn address, as he was never a student there. T. Hodgkinson, librarian of the Inn, has checked the enrollments. Hodgkinson to the writer, March 30, 1938.

[3] *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography,* XVII (1910), 435.

posed from the writer's address that he was a student at Lincoln's Inn, but such was not the case. Griffin had come to London from Virginia "in order to settle some trifling affairs,"[4] and probably had used the address of some student friend. The twenty-seven year old Virginian liked to appear important, and habitually chose as his friends "noblemen and gentlemen of distinction."[5]

Dartmouth examined the letter with its enclosure, and while we have no reason to believe that he was especially impressed, at least he concluded that it was worth saving. He endorsed it on the back, "C. Griffin, 30 December, 1775. with Plan of Reconciliation. Earl of Dartmouth." In his file it remained for more than a hundred years. In 1895 the Historical Manuscripts Commission included Griffin's letter, but not his plan of reconciliation, in the appendix to the 14th *Report,* volume II. The manuscript is in the possession of the present Earl of Dartmouth, who has very graciously furnished the writer with the following copy:

PLAN OF RECONCILIATION

That the Commissioners be instructed to meet either the whole or any number of those men who compose the Congress at any particular place except Philadelphia.

That when so met and Ceremonies adjusted they shall begin from the year 1763 and discuss each separate grievance complained of by America.

That when any point is fully debated the Meeting shall adjourn to the next day; in the meantime the Commissioners are to determine with themselves how far or whether they shall totally admit the hardship under consideration; such determination to be sent in writing upon the next morning, and by a special Officer, to the aforesaid delegates sitting to receive the same; the delegates to vote by a majority whether the determination of the Commissioners will be satisfactory.

That if there should be any points upon which The Commissioners and Delegates cannot perfectly agree those points may be referred to the wisdom of the next parliament, and the Colonies to be heard by Counsel in the said parliament.

That when all matters are finished at this united convention the Members of the Congress shall return to Philadelphia and the said Congress shall instantly dissolve themselves.

[4] Colonial Office Records, 5/115, fo. 393, transcripts in Library of Congress.
[5] *Ibid.*

That so soon as possible after the rising of the Convention the Governors of each Province shall call their respective assemblies; the aforesaid Members of the Congress to lay before the particular Assemblies of which they constitute a part, the whole plan of the negotiation and the several articles agreed upon at the said Convention; but which articles could not be finally established without the concurrence of the said assemblies.

That the different Assemblies shall ratify the above mentioned Treaty with the Commissioners if the Power of the Commissioners extend thus far, or petition the subsequent Parliament and make the said articles of accommodation the subject of their petitions.

1. objection. To treat with the Members of the Congress will acknowledge the Congress a Constitutional Body.

Ans. Not at all. It will be only treating with a number of men *out* of Congress, for by a resolution of all the Colonies, the Congress are to meet in the Town of Philadelphia, who are known to possess the confidence and affection of the people; such Treaty not being confirmed by those men which it would be if they were a constitutional body, but approved and confirmed by the different assemblies which are Constitutional Bodies. On the one hand this will satisfy parliament as not concluding or even negotiating with a congress as *the* Congress; on the other hand it will satisfy the people of America that Britain have paid so much attention to their free and uncorrupted choice of Fellow-citizens as with them to lay the foundation of amicable reconciliation.

2 Obj: The Assembly of Massachuset[t]s will never be called together under the late alteration of their Charter.

Ans. This objection may be got over in the following manner. It must be made an article of the general Compact that if the Assembly of Massachuset[t]s will be called together and confirm the said articles of Agreement in a limited time that act of parliament shall be repealed which makes an alteration in their Charter, or that a new Charter shall be given to the Colony of Massachuset[t]s, which new Charter must be drawn out by the Commissioners upon the spot and approved by the delegates.

All hostilities to cease from the moment the Commissioners arrive to America, and for ten days after the breaking up of the aforesaid convention in case they should break up without coming to stipulations of Friendship. Each party to remain in possession of their prisoners, captives and conquests till the final termination of this unhappy dispute.

The author of this plan of reconciliation had been a student at Edinburgh from 1766 to 1770, and a student at the Temple from 1771 to 1774. In 1770 he married the daughter of the Earl of Traquair, and the "trifling affair" which he returned to London to settle in the year 1774

was in reality the settlement of the estate of the deceased Earl. Because the young Earl had been married for some years without an heir being born, Griffin imagined that he would be able to induce him to share the estate with his sister, Lady Christina, whom Griffin had married. This hope proved futile, and after lingering in London for sixteen months, Griffin finally became alarmed over the safety of his family in America. In fact, at the very instant that he penned the letter to Dartmouth at Lincoln's Inn, Lord Dunmore was ravaging his native Virginia, and imperiling the life of Griffin's wife and infant son, John. Lord Germain granted Cyrus Griffin a passport in March, 1776, and he then returned to Virginia. Loyally supporting the American cause, he was in turn member of the Virginia assembly, member of the Continental Congress, president of Congress, commissioner to the Creek Indians of Georgia, and, under the newly organized United States government, first judge of the District Court for Virginia. He died in 1810, and undeservedly has become a forgotten man, obscured by the more distinguished figures among whom he moved.

Book Reviews

An Introduction to the History of Bermuda. By Wesley Frank Craven. (Reprinted from *William and Mary College Quarterly,* Second Series, XVII, Nos. 2, 3, 4; XVIII, No. 1, 1937-1938. Pp. 173, v. Map. $2.00.)

The Bermudas have received little attention from students of European expansion. Small in size, never the objects of intense rivalry like the Caribbean sugar islands, and lacking the dramatic appeal of the mainland possessions in the three Americas, this romantic archipelago has been almost entirely ignored by colonial specialists. Characteristically enough, the only scholarly monograph on the group published heretofore, Henry Wilkinson's *The Adventurers of Bermuda* (London, 1933), was the work of a popular island physician riding history as a hobby. Yet, as one of England's earliest overseas dependencies, the Bermudas offer exceptional possibilities for studying the evolution of colonizing techniques as well as the transit of old-world institutions, and consequently merit careful consideration by all persons interested in the human, economic, and administrative problems arising out of empire building.

The present work is modestly presented as a by-product of the author's well-known *Dissolution of the Virginia Company* (New York, 1932) and a study supplementing Dr. Wilkinson's volume. This underestimates its importance. It is, in reality, a notable contribution to colonial history because of the light it sheds on early English methods of establishing a trans-Atlantic dependency and operating it as a business venture, and because of its demonstration that procedure and policy were both gradually shaped through experimentation—an important point frequently overlooked. No writer on European expansion can therefore ignore it.

The "vexed Bermoothes" of Shakespeare's *Tempest* enjoyed ill repute as a graveyard of ships and were little known until 1609 when Sir George Somers was wrecked there while en route to Jamestown at the head of a Virginia Company fleet. During nearly a year of enforced residence in the islands, the passengers became well acquainted with their possibilities and rendered such enthusiastic reports that a Bermuda Company was incorporated in 1615 to exploit them. While virtually all stockholders were members of the Virginia Company, the two corporations were separate entities and the former survived the latter's extinction.

Whaling, lumbering, pearling, and sericulture had been looked to as speedy ways to wealth. All proved disappointing and tobacco planting ultimately be-

came the chief industry. Private allotments were made in an effort to stimulate initiative but much of the best land was kept in Company hands. The reconciliation of individual and corporate interests proved extremely difficult and most of the turmoil marking the colony's early years arose from this cause. A solution was, however, worked out by the trial and error method between 1618 and 1623. Proprietary interests emerged paramount but they were forced to assume the burden of their own overhead costs. Governmental machinery closely akin to that of contemporary England likewise evolved during the course of the conflict and the corporation's powers over the settlers were sharply curtailed.

All in all, it is a significant study, set forth in highly pleasing style.

George Washington University LOWELL JOSEPH RAGATZ

Kegley's Virginia Frontier; the Beginning of the Southwest; the Roanoke of Colonial Days. By B. F. Kegley. (Roanoke, Virginia: The Southwest Virginia Historical Society, 1938. Pp. xxxvi, 786. Maps, illustrations. $15.00.)

Although this work is entitled *Kegley's Virginia Frontier,* but two chapters are given to general settlement. These are introductory to the real subject, Southwest Virginia from 1740 to 1783, to which the remaining fourteen chapters are devoted. By means of records, the author attempts to show the advance of the frontier, the settlement of individuals and of villages, the locating of roads—the great migration which spread across Southwest Virginia.

The volume is replete with source material—land records, names of settlers with location and size of holdings, inventories, wills, militia rolls, service records, county court proceedings, etc. It is a repository of information in the raw, invaluable to the research student. The thousands of names of individuals should be of special interest to the genealogist, and anyone reading the book should be aided by an excellent index extending over a hundred pages.

What these records portray of movements, experiences, and conditions in the settlement of Southwest Virginia is characteristic of all frontier settlement. In these pages are revealed the strivings, successes, failures of human beings, a seething mass of humanity, crawling in and out, reproducing, eking out a livelihood, dying. Their passing leaves the area teeming with new life, no longer a frontier.

Publication invites criticism, and the reviewer is reminded of the wish in the Book of Job, "that mine adversary had written a book."

With such an accumulation of valuable records, it is unfortunate so little space is given to interpretation. The multiplicity of detail, the magnitude of minutiae leading nowhere robs the volume of much of its historical worth. In rapid succession appear pages of land grants, land transfers, wills, names of men in service, "additional" names of men in service, service records, detailed acts for the division and creation of counties and parishes, inventories, biographical

sketches, lists of all types of officers during various periods of time, revenues of counties, tithables, licenses for ordinaries, hemp certificates, "home places of interest," marriages, property lists, surveys—all given without order or connection.

"Items of Interest Among the Preston Papers" appear on pages 258 to 262. As the Preston Papers have already been published there seems little reason for inserting these items in the midst of extraneous and unrelated data.

The material of certain chapters has only chronology to hold it together. Thus, "A Hotly Contested Election in Early Augusta," pages 219 to 221, is included in the chapter, "Preparation for War." Both occurred in 1755, but the war was not an issue of the election.

In other chapters, locality is the sole connection without benefit of discussion or connecting paragraphs. For instance in Chapter XV, entitled "Community Building on the Roanoke," there are such diverse items as "Roads on the South Branch and North Fork of Roanoke," "Some Marriages on the South Branch and North Fork in Early Botetourt County," "Some Biographical and Genealogical Notes," etc.

The author is not always accurate in his attempts to summarize material outside his special field. On page 206, he gives the following account: "Fry died at Patterson's Creek, and the command devolved on Col. Washington, who had been defeated at Great Meadows on 17th April, 1754, having been dispatched from Williamsburg to Fort Cumberland in February, 1754 and having taken command of one company from New York and one from South Carolina, as well as some Virginia Companies which had been previously raised and stationed upon the frontier from whence Washington rushed into the western country, meets and defeats, a certain Jumonville, one of the enemy only escaping."

It would hardly be possible to make a statement more incorrect, couched in more awkward language. Actually Washington began recruiting troops in February, did not leave Alexandria for the frontier until April 2 (the author himself has the correct date on page 208). Not until May 28 did Washington defeat Jumonville, and was not defeated himself until July 4 when he surrendered at Fort Necessity. Instead of two independent companies, he had but one from South Carolina. The New York company never reached the front and was still at Wills Creek on July 4. The bulk of Washington's troops were Virginia companies, not the independents as the author implies. Far from rushing into the West, Washington had to advance slowly, about two to four miles a day, because of the difficulties of road making.

As the author states in his preface, he has attempted through the selection and arrangement of records to give the story of frontier development and a picture of home life on the frontier. The result is a valuable reference book, the materials of history. It is not history, for history must be both readable and interpretative.

University of Maryland HAYES BAKER-CROTHERS

Our First Great West in Revolutionary War, Diplomacy and Politics; How It Was Won in War and Politics under Virginia's Lead and under John Jay's in Diplomacy. By Temple Bodley. (Louisville, Kentucky: Filson Club, Inc., 1938. Pp. iv, 321. Illustrations, maps. $6.00.)

Any one undertaking to write a history of "Our First Great West" has the entire sympathy of this reviewer. It is a subject of prime importance in the development of our national life, yet there is little agreement among historians upon the principal points involved. Mr. Bodley has labored many years in the field, and has produced a book which should interest all who wish to understand the problem. His discussion is concerned primarily with three phases of the subject: the military struggle for the Northwest during the Revolution, the political struggle in the Continental Congress over the disposition of the region, and the diplomatic battle in Paris which resulted in extending the boundaries of the United States to the Mississippi River. The account of the military phase centers about the person of George Rogers Clark. It is given largely in Clark's own words, and adds little to what is already well known except that it stresses the effects of the capture of Kaskaskia and Vincennes upon the settlement of Kentucky and the situation in Congress. On the political side, the importance of the Indiana and Vandalia land companies is emphasized, and it would be hard to overestimate this, yet Mr. Bodley has often inferred, rather than proved, the intervention of the land companies. This is notably true in the case of New York's pretended cession of Western land to Congress. The reviewer fully agrees with the author that New York deftly took advantage of the situation in Congress to fasten her claim upon a vast Western area to which she had no tenable title, and that what she ceded was the vaguest of claims to lands lying north of the forty-second degree of latitude. Afterwards in Congress the land companies attempted to make it appear that the New York cession included lands south of that line in which they were interested; but it actually did not do so, and it is not demonstrated that there was any previous collusion between the New York assembly and these land companies.

The principal contribution of the volume is to be found in the section dealing with the negotiation in 1782 of the preliminary articles of the Peace of Paris. Here it is maintained—and unquestionably proved, contrary to the views of the late Professor Alvord—that Lord Shelburne was intent upon securing for England the country north of the Ohio River. The British minister was careful to conceal this ambition while stressing Loyalist claims, but he knew that Congress could command no funds to meet these demands and hoped to secure the Western lands under this pretext. When Jay discovered that France was making covert overtures to England with the hope of securing Gibraltar for Spain, he approached Shelburne in regard to a separate negotiation, and that official was

finally induced to surrender the Northwest as a makeweight against the contrary ambitions of France and Spain.

The author has made effective use of the Shelburne Papers in the Clements Library, but has neglected such important secondary works as those of Professor S. F. Bemis. He has dealt with a difficult subject in a lucid and interesting manner, and has produced a book which, at several points, makes significant contributions to our knowledge of the "First Great West."

University of Virginia THOMAS PERKINS ABERNETHY

McGillivray of the Creeks. By John Walton Caughey. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1938. Pp. xvii, 385. Bibliography. $3.00.)

The importance of Alexander McGillivray in the history of the Spanish-American frontier has been well recognized ever since Pickett brought out his *History of Alabama,* but it is only with the publication of the book under review that any considerable portion of the source material for his career has been made accessible. The book is made up of "McGillivray's Correspondence and Related Papers" prefaced by a fifty-seven page sketch of his life. The bulk of the correspondence consists of letters written by McGillivray (1783-1793) to various Spanish and United States officials, and to members of the firm of Panton, Leslie and Company; a smaller number of letters to McGillivray has been included. The letters have been gathered chiefly from the Spanish archives in Seville and Madrid; some have come from Cuba, some from Mexico City, and some from collections in this country. Very few of them have ever before been in print.

It would be superfluous for the reviewer to stress the value of this book to students of Southern history; it is self-evident and cannot be overestimated. It may be said, however, that the utility of this published correspondence has been greatly increased by the 356 footnotes which the editor has supplied explaining the text and referring to further sources of information. Incidentally these references reveal what a tremendous amount of source material on this period remains unpublished.

Since the documents here presented have been utilized in manuscript form, it follows that their publication does not throw any great new light on McGillivray's career. The conclusions of the author in his introductory sketch differ little from those reached by Professor Whitaker a decade ago. They indicate very strongly that McGillivray was a partner in Panton, Leslie and Company, that he connived at the coming of Bowles (1788) because of lack of supplies, and that he made the much-criticized Treaty of New York (1790) because of the Nootka Sound controversy and of the Yazoo grants. They give occasional but very valuable scraps of information about Chickasaw and Cherokee, and, in their description of the Creek, constitute practically our only bit of Indian history written by an Indian. They leave unanswered the question of McGillivray's

supineness before Bowles in his later appearance, of his reasons for swearing allegiance to the United States in 1790, and of many other things. Would the correspondence that has been omitted from this publication have thrown any light on these matters? For Mr. Caughey has not printed all the McGillivray correspondence—only those letters which, he judges, "include the most significant items." The reviewer does not mean, however, to question the author's judgment; rather, he is paying him the high and unusual compliment of wishing he had made his book larger.

Florida State College for Women R. S. COTTERILL

Old Frontiers: The Story of the Cherokee Indians from Earliest Times to the Date of Their Removal to the West, 1838. By John P. Brown. (Kingsport, Tennessee: Southern Publishers, Inc., 1938. Pp. xi, 570. Illustrations, maps, appendix, bibliography. $3.75.)

It can scarcely be gainsaid that the Indian has been a subject of perennial interest to white Americans. As long ago as 1727 Cadwallader Colden brought forth his *History of the Five Indian Nations.* And yet, more than two hundred years later, there are several red nations whose respective histories remain to be written. For the eastern Cherokee the work has been performed as a labor of love by a Chattanooga merchant. Fittingly, the volume appeared during the centennial year of the removal of the Cherokee to their new home west of the Mississippi River.

In the preface the author's purpose is defined with clarity as that of telling "mainly, the story of their [the Cherokee's] struggle to hold the land of their fathers against white encroachment. If the author's sympathy has been at times enlisted for the Indian, he has tried to present the facts impartially." Mr. Brown has written from the Indian point of view; he has sought to explain, not why the whites did certain deeds, but how the redskins interpreted those deeds and with what results. Too long there have survived the concepts of the earlier chroniclers that all frontiersmen were of heroic stature and that the red men had few, if any, rights which the whites were bound to respect. Mr. Brown has shown that the Cherokee, at least, had few rights which the whites did respect and that the frontiersmen's stature, when measured by the yardstick of fair dealing with their red neighbors, shrinks considerably. In these respects lies the chief value of the volume under review.

The narrative covers the years between 1540 and 1838. The treatment accorded the visit in the former year of Hernando de Soto is, and rightly, brief. Slightly more than two thirds of the pages are devoted to the period beginning about 1700, when the Cherokee "formed trading relations with the Virginians" (p. 41), and ending ninety-four years later, when the nation formally and finally ceased its wars against the whites. Strangely, the author ignores the

supineness before Bowles in his later appearance, of his reasons for swearing allegiance to the United States in 1790, and of many other things. Would the correspondence that has been omitted from this publication have thrown any light on these matters? For Mr. Caughey has not printed all the McGillivray correspondence—only those letters which, he judges, "include the most significant items." The reviewer does not mean, however, to question the author's judgment; rather, he is paying him the high and unusual compliment of wishing he had made his book larger.

Florida State College for Women R. S. COTTERILL

Old Frontiers: The Story of the Cherokee Indians from Earliest Times to the Date of Their Removal to the West, 1838. By John P. Brown. (Kingsport, Tennessee: Southern Publishers, Inc., 1938. Pp. xi, 570. Illustrations, maps, appendix, bibliography. $3.75.)

It can scarcely be gainsaid that the Indian has been a subject of perennial interest to white Americans. As long ago as 1727 Cadwallader Colden brought forth his *History of the Five Indian Nations.* And yet, more than two hundred years later, there are several red nations whose respective histories remain to be written. For the eastern Cherokee the work has been performed as a labor of love by a Chattanooga merchant. Fittingly, the volume appeared during the centennial year of the removal of the Cherokee to their new home west of the Mississippi River.

In the preface the author's purpose is defined with clarity as that of telling "mainly, the story of their [the Cherokee's] struggle to hold the land of their fathers against white encroachment. If the author's sympathy has been at times enlisted for the Indian, he has tried to present the facts impartially." Mr. Brown has written from the Indian point of view; he has sought to explain, not why the whites did certain deeds, but how the redskins interpreted those deeds and with what results. Too long there have survived the concepts of the earlier chroniclers that all frontiersmen were of heroic stature and that the red men had few, if any, rights which the whites were bound to respect. Mr. Brown has shown that the Cherokee, at least, had few rights which the whites did respect and that the frontiersmen's stature, when measured by the yardstick of fair dealing with their red neighbors, shrinks considerably. In these respects lies the chief value of the volume under review.

The narrative covers the years between 1540 and 1838. The treatment accorded the visit in the former year of Hernando de Soto is, and rightly, brief. Slightly more than two thirds of the pages are devoted to the period beginning about 1700, when the Cherokee "formed trading relations with the Virginians" (p. 41), and ending ninety-four years later, when the nation formally and finally ceased its wars against the whites. Strangely, the author ignores the

Needham-Arthur expedition, sent out from Virginia in 1673, which reached an aboriginal people dwelling, so practically all students of the subject agree, in present East Tennessee. It is also strange that the peaceful period, 1795-1838, is allotted no more than eighty-one pages.

There are numerous well-chosen illustrations, plus several maps, among which that opposite page 1, "The Cherokee Country," a compilation by the author, is of great aid to the reader. Appendixes contain a Cherokee vocabulary, a descriptive list of their land cessions, and the text of one of the treaties of Sycamore Shoals (1775). The index is inadequate. The bibliography of about 100 titles will scarcely bear scrutiny. For some of the titles full bibliographical information is supplied; for others, the information is incomplete, misleading, or incorrect. In neither bibliography nor citations does one encounter the titles of a number of good secondary treatments of special phases of the subject. Then, too, in addition to the manuscript collections appropriately cited there are certain others, such as the Papers of the Continental Congress in the Library of Congress, which might have been consulted to advantage.

Too many statements are unsupported by citations. The proofreading was regrettably lax. More regrettable are several misstatements of fact, to only one of which attention can here be called. Missionaries first appeared among the Cherokee not in 1784 (as stated on page 466), but a generation earlier. There is no discussion in the text of the important Anglo-Cherokee treaty negotiated at Lochaber, South Carolina, in October, 1770. The book is easy to read; Mr. Brown has infused into the narrative something of his own enthusiasm for his subject.

The National Archives W. NEIL FRANKLIN

The Territorial Papers of the United States. Volume VI, *The Territory of Mississippi, 1809-1817.* Compiled and edited by Clarence Edwin Carter. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1938. Pp. v, 893. $1.50.)

Your reviewer had the good fortune to discuss the earlier volume on Mississippi in this series, in a previous issue of this *Journal,* and finds little to add to what he said then. As is inherent in the problem of publishing such records, almost the only real quarrel which can be picked with an editor is in the selection of documents to be included. Mr. Carter's scholarly editorial care guarantees for this volume the same minute accuracy which characterized its predecessors, and the same thoroughness in checking collateral and corollary sources, including secondary works. No point of criticism can possibly arise, therefore, unless in the mind of some historian who for a variety of reasons would have used different criteria of selection.

In this second volume on Mississippi, Mr. Carter has drawn his documents from the same sources as before, mainly the departments of state, treasury, war,

Needham-Arthur expedition, sent out from Virginia in 1673, which reached an aboriginal people dwelling, so practically all students of the subject agree, in present East Tennessee. It is also strange that the peaceful period, 1795-1838, is allotted no more than eighty-one pages.

There are numerous well-chosen illustrations, plus several maps, among which that opposite page 1, "The Cherokee Country," a compilation by the author, is of great aid to the reader. Appendixes contain a Cherokee vocabulary, a descriptive list of their land cessions, and the text of one of the treaties of Sycamore Shoals (1775). The index is inadequate. The bibliography of about 100 titles will scarcely bear scrutiny. For some of the titles full bibliographical information is supplied; for others, the information is incomplete, misleading, or incorrect. In neither bibliography nor citations does one encounter the titles of a number of good secondary treatments of special phases of the subject. Then, too, in addition to the manuscript collections appropriately cited there are certain others, such as the Papers of the Continental Congress in the Library of Congress, which might have been consulted to advantage.

Too many statements are unsupported by citations. The proofreading was regrettably lax. More regrettable are several misstatements of fact, to only one of which attention can here be called. Missionaries first appeared among the Cherokee not in 1784 (as stated on page 466), but a generation earlier. There is no discussion in the text of the important Anglo-Cherokee treaty negotiated at Lochaber, South Carolina, in October, 1770. The book is easy to read; Mr. Brown has infused into the narrative something of his own enthusiasm for his subject.

The National Archives W. NEIL FRANKLIN

The Territorial Papers of the United States. Volume VI, *The Territory of Mississippi, 1809-1817.* Compiled and edited by Clarence Edwin Carter. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1938. Pp. v, 893. $1.50.)

Your reviewer had the good fortune to discuss the earlier volume on Mississippi in this series, in a previous issue of this *Journal,* and finds little to add to what he said then. As is inherent in the problem of publishing such records, almost the only real quarrel which can be picked with an editor is in the selection of documents to be included. Mr. Carter's scholarly editorial care guarantees for this volume the same minute accuracy which characterized its predecessors, and the same thoroughness in checking collateral and corollary sources, including secondary works. No point of criticism can possibly arise, therefore, unless in the mind of some historian who for a variety of reasons would have used different criteria of selection.

In this second volume on Mississippi, Mr. Carter has drawn his documents from the same sources as before, mainly the departments of state, treasury, war,

interior, and post office, the House and Senate files, and the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress. Subject matter covers the period from the first administration of Governor David Holmes (1809) to the admission of Mississippi into the Union in 1817. As in the first volume, one notes especially the omission of Indian affairs and military matters, even though many documents come from the war office. The omission of these subjects is especially interesting in this volume in that it covers the period of the War of 1812, one phase of which—the Creek War—was of vital interest to the inhabitants of the Territory. One feels, therefore, that Mr. Carter might have been justified in relaxing his rule on Indians and warfare in dealing with this period.

This feeling cannot be very strong, however, when one has so much to be grateful for. For example, information, previously difficult to get, is now easily accessible in regard to intricate local politics in the Territory, the diabolically complicated land claims, the hairsplitting differences of opinion on division of the Territory, the reasons for delay in admitting Mississippi, and a half dozen other matters important to local historians and heretofore more or less obscure.

Your reviewer feels himself forced to conclude, therefore, that complaint about omitted material is improper, and that the correct attitude is one of prayer for an extension of the project which will permit the publication of all the documents of importance bearing on territorial history. Possibly historians will be sorry that Mr. Carter's publications will force them to rewrite much of this history, but they owe him only thanks for giving them wherewithal to do it.

Only one other point seems worthy of mention; although your reviewer is no judge of book stock, he nevertheless risks the opinion that the paper on which this series is published appears not sufficiently durable for a work of this kind.

Georgia State College for Women MACK SWEARINGEN

Isaac Franklin, Slave Trader and Planter of the Old South. By Wendell Holmes Stephenson. (University, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1938. Pp. xi, 368. Illustrations, bibliography. $3.00.)

This is a scholarly work, well planned and well executed. More than this, it offers the rare combination of being both interesting and valuable. The author treats two historically controversial subjects, the ante-bellum slave trader and the ante-bellum cotton planter, with absolute fairness. There is no trace of bias or prejudice. We, of course, have a right to expect this attitude in a teacher of history, trained in the modern school. But those of us who are old enough, know how to appreciate these qualities in a student of Southern questions and problems who was born and reared and educated outside the South.

Dr. Stephenson has found a unique individual in the person of the central character of his study. Isaac Franklin was a living demonstration of what could be accomplished by native sense, good business instinct and judgment, and un-

interior, and post office, the House and Senate files, and the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress. Subject matter covers the period from the first administration of Governor David Holmes (1809) to the admission of Mississippi into the Union in 1817. As in the first volume, one notes especially the omission of Indian affairs and military matters, even though many documents come from the war office. The omission of these subjects is especially interesting in this volume in that it covers the period of the War of 1812, one phase of which—the Creek War—was of vital interest to the inhabitants of the Territory. One feels, therefore, that Mr. Carter might have been justified in relaxing his rule on Indians and warfare in dealing with this period.

This feeling cannot be very strong, however, when one has so much to be grateful for. For example, information, previously difficult to get, is now easily accessible in regard to intricate local politics in the Territory, the diabolically complicated land claims, the hairsplitting differences of opinion on division of the Territory, the reasons for delay in admitting Mississippi, and a half dozen other matters important to local historians and heretofore more or less obscure.

Your reviewer feels himself forced to conclude, therefore, that complaint about omitted material is improper, and that the correct attitude is one of prayer for an extension of the project which will permit the publication of all the documents of importance bearing on territorial history. Possibly historians will be sorry that Mr. Carter's publications will force them to rewrite much of this history, but they owe him only thanks for giving them wherewithal to do it.

Only one other point seems worthy of mention; although your reviewer is no judge of book stock, he nevertheless risks the opinion that the paper on which this series is published appears not sufficiently durable for a work of this kind.

Georgia State College for Women MACK SWEARINGEN

Isaac Franklin, Slave Trader and Planter of the Old South. By Wendell Holmes Stephenson. (University, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1938. Pp. xi, 368. Illustrations, bibliography. $3.00.)

This is a scholarly work, well planned and well executed. More than this, it offers the rare combination of being both interesting and valuable. The author treats two historically controversial subjects, the ante-bellum slave trader and the ante-bellum cotton planter, with absolute fairness. There is no trace of bias or prejudice. We, of course, have a right to expect this attitude in a teacher of history, trained in the modern school. But those of us who are old enough, know how to appreciate these qualities in a student of Southern questions and problems who was born and reared and educated outside the South.

Dr. Stephenson has found a unique individual in the person of the central character of his study. Isaac Franklin was a living demonstration of what could be accomplished by native sense, good business instinct and judgment, and un-

limited determination. It required all of these qualities to make a respectable and respected cotton planter of a man who made his fortune in the despised business of the slave trader.

The author has done a large amount of research work in assembling the material which he has used to such good purpose. About one third of the book is given to a narrative account of Franklin's slave trading and planting activities. These cover his slave buying and selling transactions in Alexandria, D. C., in Natchez, and in New Orleans, and his planting operations in Tennessee and Louisiana. The story is interesting throughout and is an excellent interpretation and expansion of the documents and exhibits which follow in well-ordered sequence.

Parts II and III (pp. 121-339) contain valuable exhibits of foundation material on ante-bellum plantation economy. These cover details of prices of every item of plantation necessity, from the slave labor itself to the general equipment of livestock, tools, and machinery. Drugs, food, clothing, etc., are all included. There are also a number of account sales of cotton, lumber, wood, and other plantation products. The book is the result of research work prosecuted through ten years and is a definitely important contribution to the authoritative literature of the period of which it treats. There is a good index, also an excellent bibliography.

Jackson, Mississippi — ALFRED H. STONE

Fanny Kemble: A Passionate Victorian. By Margaret Armstrong. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938. Pp. vi, 387. Frontispiece. $3.00.)

The purpose of any biography is to present against a background of the age in which he lived a vivid, accurate picture of an individual. The author may act merely as a stage director, manipulating his puppet with an invisible hand, so arranging material that the character presents his own personality; or the writer may become the mouthpiece through whom his character seeks to speak. Only the first can purport to be an accurate presentation, for one individual can scarcely hope to interpret correctly the thoughts and actions of another.

So, although Miss Armstrong speaks of Fanny Kemble, the descendant of the "pompous Kembles" who lived in the theatrical atmosphere of the stage and of the temperamental French DeCamps, "that fine piece of changeable silk," as the backwoodsman Davy Crockett described her, somehow manages to escape from under her biographer's pen, the pen which attempts to be her mouthpiece. One lays aside the story wondering why almost every great or near great of the nineteenth century fell under her spell. For, in popular parlance, fall they did. Scarcely a diary, a journal, or a sequence of letters of that period fails to mention her theatrical successes or her intellectual abilities. From the time of her brilliant debut as the untutored actress of twenty at Covent Garden in 1829, through her

limited determination. It required all of these qualities to make a respectable and respected cotton planter of a man who made his fortune in the despised business of the slave trader.

The author has done a large amount of research work in assembling the material which he has used to such good purpose. About one third of the book is given to a narrative account of Franklin's slave trading and planting activities. These cover his slave buying and selling transactions in Alexandria, D. C., in Natchez, and in New Orleans, and his planting operations in Tennessee and Louisiana. The story is interesting throughout and is an excellent interpretation and expansion of the documents and exhibits which follow in well-ordered sequence.

Parts II and III (pp. 121-339) contain valuable exhibits of foundation material on ante-bellum plantation economy. These cover details of prices of every item of plantation necessity, from the slave labor itself to the general equipment of livestock, tools, and machinery. Drugs, food, clothing, etc., are all included. There are also a number of account sales of cotton, lumber, wood, and other plantation products. The book is the result of research work prosecuted through ten years and is a definitely important contribution to the authoritative literature of the period of which it treats. There is a good index, also an excellent bibliography.

Jackson, Mississippi — ALFRED H. STONE

Fanny Kemble: A Passionate Victorian. By Margaret Armstrong. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938. Pp. vi, 387. Frontispiece. $3.00.)

The purpose of any biography is to present against a background of the age in which he lived a vivid, accurate picture of an individual. The author may act merely as a stage director, manipulating his puppet with an invisible hand, so arranging material that the character presents his own personality; or the writer may become the mouthpiece through whom his character seeks to speak. Only the first can purport to be an accurate presentation, for one individual can scarcely hope to interpret correctly the thoughts and actions of another.

So, although Miss Armstrong speaks of Fanny Kemble, the descendant of the "pompous Kembles" who lived in the theatrical atmosphere of the stage and of the temperamental French DeCamps, "that fine piece of changeable silk," as the backwoodsman Davy Crockett described her, somehow manages to escape from under her biographer's pen, the pen which attempts to be her mouthpiece. One lays aside the story wondering why almost every great or near great of the nineteenth century fell under her spell. For, in popular parlance, fall they did. Scarcely a diary, a journal, or a sequence of letters of that period fails to mention her theatrical successes or her intellectual abilities. From the time of her brilliant debut as the untutored actress of twenty at Covent Garden in 1829, through her

theatrical successes in England and America, both as an actress and as a dramatic reader, artists, authors, musicians, and politicians followed her achievements and failures: Sir Thomas Lawrence, Henry Greville, the Tennysons, Edward Fitzgerald, Daniel Webster, Charles Sumner, and Andrew Jackson, to mention only a few.

Born in 1809, the daughter of Charles Kemble and Therese DeCamp, Frances Anne fell heir by inheritance to the traditions of England's most famous theatrical family, the family of "Glorious John" and of Mrs. Siddons, and to the temperamental sensitiveness and charm which made her mother the little dancing fairy of the Le Texier troupe. A precocious but irritating child, she left home at the age of five to be educated in private schools in England and France. At the age of twenty, in the attempt to salvage the remnants of a family fortune, she was thrown as a pawn on to the stage of Covent Garden and into a profession which she despised for its unreality. Natural histrionic ability carried her to success there and then for two years in America, where she went with her father in 1832.

Here she remained to marry Pierce Butler of the South Carolina slaveholding Butlers and Middletons, a marriage which a little logical forethought would have labelled "On the Rocks" before it took place. She lived as his wife long enough to become the mother of two daughters and, incidentally, the grandmother of the novelist Owen Wister, and to write an eyewitness account of the slave system in operation on the Butlers' Georgia sea island plantations. Finally, after years of misunderstandings, and doubtless to the genuine relief of both, she left Pierce Butler, to find consolation during the remainder of her long life—nearly fifty additional years—in the natural beauties of Italy, Switzerland, and New England, in friendships on two continents, in her dramatic interpretations of Shakespeare's plays, and in writing and publishing numerous memoirs, journals, poems, and critical works. Even in her last years she retained sufficient mental vitality to count among her intimate friends such intellectuals as Henry James.

Although Miss Armstrong's book recounts many of these facts—she barely notices "Notes upon Some of Shakespeare's Plays," and "On the Stage," characterized by the contemporary artist George Arliss as the most careful analysis in dramatic criticism of the actor in juxtaposition with his art—it is not an account likely to concern the serious, inquiring reader. Written in a popular style, it will provide entertainment for the casual reader who prefers impressionistic interpretations. One might question the appropriateness of the subtitle. In the generally accepted meaning of the term, Fanny Kemble was not particularly passionate, but, rather, domineering, emotional, sensitive, and stubborn. Likewise, she was far from a thoroughgoing Victorian, as witnessed by her insubordination to her husband in an age when married women were not supposed to have or at least not to voice opinions of their own, and her deserting him when divorce was a far more serious matter than it is today.

The chief merit of Miss Armstrong's study is its style, which allows her to tell an interesting story, although occasionally the personality of Fanny Kemble is obscured by a superabundance of background material. She uses language effectively, in spite of the fact that some readers are still old-fashioned enough to think that a subordinate clause is not a complete sentence. One doubts that the author has pursued her sources thoroughly or widely. The book has neither documentation nor bibliography, and the index is quite scanty, perhaps an admission by the writer that she does not intend it for the serious reader or the scholar.

Vanderbilt University LEOTA S. DRIVER

The Old Northwest as the Keystone of the Arch of American Federal Union: A Study in Commerce and Politics. By A. L. Kohlmeier. (Bloomington, Indiana: The Principia Press, 1938. Pp. v, 257. $2.50.)

This significant monograph is concerned with the Old Northwest, its commerce with the rest of the world, and its place in the Union. Its well-being depended upon its ability to export its surplus commodities in payment for its imports. There were three gateways for this commerce; the Southern, through New Orleans; the Eastern, through the ports of Philadelphia and Baltimore; and the Northeastern, through New York or the St. Lawrence Valley. The Ohio Valley was settled first by immigrants from the Southern and Middle States, who used the Southern and Eastern routes. Efforts to connect this region with the South Atlantic ports failed; the Great Lakes area was settled by people of New England ancestry, who used the Northeastern route; and the Ohio Valley grew less rapidly than the newer northern portions of the Old Northwest. Commerce increased with expanding population and surpluses, and the improvement of the routes of trade. Politicians struggled with sectional interests in respect to land policy, tariff, and internal improvements. Polk's policy of Western expansion and reduction of tariffs, and the repeal of the British corn laws advanced the interests of the Lower South and the Great Lakes region but did little for the Ohio Valley. England became more dependent upon wheat than upon cotton. The wheat growing region, which became more firmly attached to the Northeast, secured better prices and more settlers. The lower half of the Old Northwest, likewise, became more firmly attached to the South, but its growth was now slower than that of the nation as a whole.

The danger of sectional cleavage in 1850 brought a realization of the value of the Union to the Old Northwest. Efforts were made to bind North and South more closely together and transportation routes within the Old Northwest were extended and improved. Little change resulted, however, and exports produced north of the Old National Road were transported over the Northeastern channel while those of the Ohio Valley used the Eastern or Southern gateways. During the middle fifties the sections struggled to secure the eastern terminus of a pro-

posed railway to the Pacific and sectional leaders again became aggressive. The West began to realize the importance of keeping all of its commercial lines unbroken, because cities like Chicago and Cincinnati were using all three outlets. Competition of the consolidated railroads brought lower rates, thus proving the value of having alternate routes. An enormous increase in the production of cereals and cattle in the Great Lakes region enlarged commerce to the Northeast. The Eastern route, drawing from this area as well as the Ohio Valley, became almost as important as the Southern route. The exports of the latter increased absolutely but not relatively.

Secession of Southern states brought a crisis to the people of the Old Northwest. New Orleans was a little less important to them but the South was as important in 1860 as in 1835. The railroads had not weaned the Ohio Valley away from its connection with the South. "The people of the Ohio Valley did not decide to fight the people of the South so much because they had concluded that they could get along economically without the South . . . ." Indeed, "they believed that they could not get along without it." The Old Northwest could not think of being divided between the North and South. It could not become a part of either, nor could it be independent of both. Only by preserving the nation intact could it continue to use its three main avenues of commerce. Early interference with the trade of the Mississippi River made easier its decision to deny the right of secession. Because no other section had so much to lose by national disintegration, the Old Northwest was the keystone of the arch of the Federal Union.

The work is written in a good, clear style. The large amount of statistics makes it a little heavy in places, but it does not appear certain that they could be relegated to footnotes or to appendixes for they are an integral part of the text. Documentation is quite adequate, but it is hardly a substitute for a bibliography. The material has not been extensively used and, therefore, its presentation in bibliographical form would be all the more welcome. It is doubtful whether the use of the term "Old West" (pp. 129, 132, 146) conforms with the generally accepted understanding of the term.

Students of Southern history will find in the work further understanding of the failure of the Ohio Valley to continue its traditional attachment to the South. All who are interested in the history of the Old Northwest and its place in the Union will also find this a stimulating book. While it is an important addition to the literature of sectionalism, its chief significance lies in its explanation of the superior strength of national unity in the face of sectional division.

Louisiana State University JOHN D. BARNHART

A Gentleman of the Old Natchez Region: Benjamin L. C. Wailes. By Charles S. Sydnor. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1938. Pp. xii, 337. Illustrations, bibliography. $3.00.)

There are certain men whose lives are inseparable from the community in which they function. The careers of some of these men may be likened to the growth of a stately tree, whose roots reach deep into the earth and from whose sturdy trunk branches stem in all directions. While it lives this tree is an integral part of the landscape, but as the soil gradually becomes barren, the tree withers and loses its strength, and when storm and flood come that way it falls to the ground. Yet, though the landscape is now changed and life is gone from the tree, enough remains so that the skilled and imaginative historian can recover a clear view of its appearance and environment. Like this tree was Benjamin L. C. Wailes. He has been fortunate in his biographer for Charles S. Sydnor possesses the qualities to interpret his subject, recreate the contemporary scene, and incidentally give us a vivid and appealing portrait of an aristocrat, agriculturist, intellectual, and human being.

The career of Wailes spanned the development of the Natchez region from a crude frontier civilization to a more settled and stable order, dominated by a planter aristocracy, and toward the end, the threatened destruction of that order by the fortunes of Civil War. For a little time the Whigs of the Natchez district exercised much influence on state politics, but before long the Democratic majority, living elsewhere in Mississippi, took over the control of the destinies of the state and thereafter the residents of Natchez and its vicinity formed a conservative and aristocratically inclined island, bounded by the Mississippi on the west and surrounded on the other three sides by the supporters of the Democratic party. Wailes possessed capabilities for public life and service above the average, and if he had chosen to change his residence to another part of the state and had embraced the doctrines of the Democratic party, he might have gone far. He apparently realized this, but such a course was foreign to his nature and he deliberately chose to live in Washington County.

Within this community which he knew so well and in which he played a leading part, Wailes endeavored to promote intellectual improvement along varied lines. In the town of Washington he encouraged literary and scientific activities, promoted an agricultural society, engaged in extensive research as a naturalist, gave of his time and money to Jefferson College, aided in the formation of the Mississippi Historical Society, and operated his own and several other plantations. He traveled widely in his own state and in other parts of the country. His most complete undertaking was a geological survey of the state of Mississippi, begun in 1852 and published in 1854, an extensive and valuable work at that time.

Wailes had the simplicity, dignity, and conservatism of a true aristocrat. Although in a sense never socially minded, *noblesse oblige* was instinctive in his

attitude toward individuals. Consistently a hard worker, he exercised his talents in many directions. Unfortunately the soil, in which he sought to develop a higher cultural civilization in his community, was shallow, and while many of his efforts temporarily flourished, in the end they only brought him distress and difficulty. Wailes regarded himself as a practical man, but his conduct of his plantations and relations with overseers would not seem to bear this out. A strain of frustration and a feeling of futility in his life are apparent in his Diary. Like many of the detailed diaries, which have been kept over a period of years (Wailes left thirty-six volumes), his record is basically a defense of a way of life, an explanation to himself and to posterity, to justify what he did or did not do.

This intriguing study of an important ante-bellum figure, written by one of the younger historians of the South, is a worthwhile product of the Duke University Press not only with respect to content but also for appearance, typography, format, and printing. The maps, including the front and end plates, are well chosen and clearly reproduced. The Press might have been more liberal with respect to illustrations. The two pictures of Wailes are scarcely enough. One misses views of early Natchez, Jefferson College, the residences of Wailes in Washington and those on his plantations, as well as portraits of members of his family and certain of his contemporaries and associates. Incidentally, the footnote numbers are too small, making them difficult to read. The years of research which the author has given to his life of Wailes are abundantly evident in the text, ample footnotes, and bibliography. That he has been intellectually honest in his portrayal is obvious. The style is readable, although at times it seems slightly abrupt. Perhaps this is because the author throughout has adhered rather closely to the facts gleaned from the sources. These, assembled from widely scattered places, have not always been sufficiently amalgamated to form a smooth flowing narrative.

If the reader is interested in the detail of a very human life, as well as the development of an important intellectual center in the South, he will find both in Professor Sydnor's *A Gentleman of the Old Natchez Region: Benjamin L. C. Wailes.*

McCormick Historical Association HERBERT A. KELLAR

Semmes of the Alabama. By W. Adolphe Roberts. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1938. Pp. 320. Bibliography, illustrations. $3.50.)

This is a colorful biography of Raphael Semmes, the most colorful naval figure produced by the War of Secession. As the title suggests, the emphasis is laid on the hero's incomparable career as a sea raider under the Stars and Bars. The opening chapter suffices the author to chalk out a quick picture of his earlier life, and the two concluding chapters to tell of the days after the war. One would like to have been shown closer pictures of young Raphael at the steerage

mess on old-fashioned sloops of war and frigates, as a watch officer, as ship's captain under both sail and steam, and ashore in Mexico with Scott. Nor does his one principal prior biographer (Colyer Meriwether) give us such pictures. Mr. Roberts, in his "Portrait of a Secessionist," is mainly concerned in presenting a bare outline of the background and experience which lay behind the man who took the first Confederate cruiser upon the high seas. He is also concerned to reconcile Semmes' ardent expansionist views of Mexican War days with his later fervent defense of state rights; and this he does on the basis of the contribution of the Western acquisitions to Southern nationalism, of which Semmes was ever, unconsciously at first and consciously later, a warm proponent.

The book, done in popular style without documentation but with a brief bibliography of the items which the author found the most valuable, is in many respects merely a delightful retelling of Semmes' own story as given in his *Service Afloat* on the *Sumter* and the *Alabama*—with, of course, additions from the published memoirs of two of his subordinates, Kell and Sinclair, and of the navy agent, Bullock, who outfitted the *Alabama*. At special points reliance can be seen upon the other listed works and upon unpublished material. The book is unusually well turned out, with end paper charts of the cruise of the *Alabama* upon the seven seas, seventeen illustrations, a fine index, and three appendixes. The last include a description of the Alabama Claims, a list of captures by the two Confederate cruisers, and a sample of the judicial decisions which Semmes—international law expert and member of the bar as well as sailorman—sitting as a sort of roving judge in admiralty, delighted to prepare to support the legality of his prizes.

Were not this review being written for historical students, it would stop here, for I find little fault with the book as a popular biography. However, the author says (p. 11) that Semmes was "the fifth in descent from Benedict Joseph Semmes, of Normandy, France, who came over with Lord Baltimore in 1640, in the *Ark and Dove*." Meriwether in 1913 stated that, "The father of Raphael Semmes was Richard Thompson Semmes, according to the best authority 'fifth in descent from the first American ancestor, Benedict Joseph Semmes, of Normandy, France, who came over with Lord Baltimore in 1640,' in the *Ark and Dove*." In thus following Meriwether, Roberts ignored a genealogical work which came out five years later from the pen of a member of the family. Raphael Thomas Semmes, in *The Semmes and Allied Families* (1918), gave the immigrant ancestor as the great-great-grandfather Marmaduke, but said that whence and when he came are not known. On page 16 Roberts states that Semmes served a year as master of chronometers at Norfolk, whereas the navy department records show that this service was performed in Washington. Also he states that Semmes studied law for two years in his brother's office at Cumberland, Maryland, whereas the naval records show that he was never on leave for as much as two years at a single time prior to his admission to the bar. On page

79 he states that Bullock resigned from the United States navy in consequence of the secession of Georgia, whereas Bullock had previously resigned his lieutenancy in the navy to accept a command in a private line of mail steamers. On page 96 he states that as part of the ceremony of commissioning the *Alabama,* Semmes read his commission as captain. This was on Sunday, August 24, 1862, and it was not until the next day that, entirely unbeknown to Semmes, thousands of miles away in Richmond, he was promoted from commander to captain. On page 192 he assumes that he is quoting from Semmes' journal, when he is actually quoting from *Service Afloat,* thus imputing to an afterthought the quality of foreboding. On page 197, in listing the armament of the *Kearsarge,* he omits a 12-pounder howitzer, from which ten rounds were fired during the battle. In the list of prizes (p. 283), he includes two vessels, the *Clara L. Sparks* and the *Nina,* not mentioned in the *Official Records* or in any account that I have seen; and a couple of dates do not agree with the *Official Records.* The "judicial decree" given in Appendix III would appear to be quoted from the Semmes' journal but it is actually a quotation from the repolished version in *Service Afloat.* One would like to know the sources for the statements (p. 201) that Semmes attended mass at Cherbourg on the *evening* before the battle, and that Semmes' son Oliver commanded "the only battery of regulars in the Confederacy" (p. 221); also, for the meeting between Semmes and Mallory (pp. 225-26), of which there is no mention in the former's memoirs.

Augusta, Georgia WILLIAM M. ROBINSON, JR.

The Yankee Cheese Box. By Robert Stanley McCordock. (Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company, 1938. Pp. 470. Bibliography. $3.00.)

This is the first work of length on the construction and activities of America's original ironclads. There can be no question that the subject is covered well and in detail; but the details submerge the narrative. The volume is swamped with press notices and comments from every portion of the North and South to the exclusion of the author's own views, even of summaries. There are plenty of quotations on the moot controversy of who won the battle of March 9, 1862, from editors, politicians, and naval experts, but the author is noncommittal and gives no opinion of his own.

Professor McCordock gives the *Merrimac* and the *Monitor* much more credit for influencing the British naval reconstruction than does Baxter (*Introduction of the Ironclad Warship*), but perhaps not more than his evidence warrants. To the reviewer the chief contribution of the revamped *Merrimac* was in its temporary influence upon McClellan's Peninsular campaign. Although McClellan's possibility of success is usually not taken with much seriousness today, we do not know the possibilities of his hundred thousands if the *Merrimac* had not restricted his advance to the York River flank, blocking that along the James.

The book is certainly a contribution to the naval literature of the War between the States, despite its rather encyclopedic construction. It is regrettable that it is not better bound. The lack of an index is still more regrettable.

Southern Methodist University H. A. TREXLER

Recollections of War and Peace, 1861-1868. By Anna Pierpont Siviter. Edited by Charles Henry Ambler. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1938. Pp. xxxviii, 393. Illustrations. $3.50.)

Ever since Henry A. Wise characterized West Virginia as "the bastard child of a political rape," historians and patriots of that state have tried to justify the dismemberment of Virginia. Among those challenging Wise's statement was Anna P. Siviter, the talented and loyal daughter of Governor Francis H. Pierpont. Some forty years after the Civil War, she began writing her recollections of the years 1861-1868, with a view to explaining the formation of the "Mountain State" and to preserving "the memory and achievements of her father" (p. viii).

This book, which the editor considers a companion volume of his recent scholarly life of Pierpont, is based on the Governor's recollections and papers more than on his daughter's memory. This is particularly true of the early portion which is concerned with Pierpont's significant role in the establishment of the restored Virginia government at Wheeling, and later at Alexandria, and with the creation of West Virginia. She was, in fact, only seven years old at the close of the war. At Richmond, where her father was governor 1865-1868, her personal impressions, because of her added years, are of more importance in her story. In this part of her *Recollections,* she presents vivid and valuable pictures of the freedmen's plight and the haughty disdain with which the ex-Confederates held her family and friends. She portrays little sympathy for Carpetbaggers and less for Southern arrogance and blunders which, she insists, accounted for the success of the Radicals' program. In the whole book there is little information not included in Mr. Ambler's *Francis H. Pierpont,* but hers has the distinction of being a primary source and, in fact, of being the basis of Professor Ambler's own story.

Mrs. Siviter did not complete her manuscript. The editor, therefore, had to make a few changes for the sake of clarity but never, he states, to the extent of altering the meaning or purpose of the author "even in the interest of possible greater accuracy" (p. x). In his notes, which are numbered continuously throughout the book rather than by chapters, the editor contributes much valuable information, especially about relatively obscure leaders.

A few quotations in the *Recollections* are slightly different from the same ones in Mr. Ambler's *Francis H. Pierpont.* A comparison of E. P. Hall's letter copied on pages 47 and 406-407 of the *Recollections* and *Francis H. Pierpont,*

respectively, and a comparison of the clause which begins "a Virginia gentleman" on pages 240 and 321 of the two works, are examples of such discrepancies.

Mrs. Siviter's book has a satisfactory index, a copy of a photograph, and three poems by the author.

Birmingham-Southern College HENRY T. SHANKS

Old Sherry: Portrait of a Virginia Family. By Frank J. Klingberg. (Richmond: Garrett and Massie, Incorporated, 1938. Pp. xi, 218. Illustrations. $3.00.)

Of the 218 pages of which this little volume is composed, 160 contain the letters of William Wirt Wysor, written from Jerez and Cadiz, Spain, where he was vice-consul from 1893 to 1897. The editor, Professor Klingberg, has written 43 pages, while the remaining 15 contain some notes from the family records.

The material that is of general historical interest is contained almost exclusively in the pages of the editor. He traces the German Wysors (originally Weiser) and Ammens from Pennsylvania to Virginia. Here they intermarried with the English Jordans, the French Charltons, and the Irish Eads, and prospered in wealth, influence, and number. About the middle of the eighteenth century they settled in Southwest Virginia, at Newbern, Pulaski County—on the banks of New River. There the Wysor family, with whom the book is chiefly concerned, remained until the twentieth century. The westward movement and the Civil War affected this part of the country, and with it the Wysor family, profoundly. These influences are explained and illustrated.

As for the letters and their author the editor says: "William Wirt Wysor, unsuspectingly, was in doctrine a philosophical Deist, but in training and in practical living a Pietist, according to family traditions. And, in experience, he was a post Civil War Virginian, home grown, unworldly, and unpretentious. His charming simplicity drew warm friends to him, not only Spanish, Swedish, and Russian, but particularly English. His Anglo-American legacy made him closely akin to the British and an ever welcome guest in their midst. An exile from the quiet, almost rural Virginia, with its eighteenth century charm, he tells of the strongly contrasted life as he saw it in the most Latin and most Roman Catholic corner of Europe, a country with a heritage, Roman and Moorish, as well as Christian. At Cadiz, he watched American vessels come and go, saw the growth of the sea power that was to defeat an ageing Spain in Asia and in the Caribbean and to make America imperialistic. His letters, intended only for domestic consumption, tell the story of exactly what he found in the Spain of the 1890's. And without knowing it, he also told his own story and gave us the portrait of a family" (p. 207).

The above statement is perfectly true, and the letters are charmingly written, but it is also true that the writer addressed himself to simple and unpretentious

folk. For the student of thought and affairs there is little here. There are brief references to such topics as the difficulties of the Spanish language, Europeans who speak three or four languages, bull fights, parties, Spanish wines and women, financial difficulties, mistreatment by the American consul, the slowness of Spanish life, and almost innumerable references to petty family affairs and local gossip. The statements of real historical importance could be condensed into half a dozen pages.

The title of the book, *Old Sherry,* apparently comes from Jerez, the town near Cadiz in which Wysor spent most of his time while in Spain. The English used to call it Sherry.

West Liberty State Teachers College C. C. REGIER

Memoirs of Richard Cannon Watts, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of South Carolina, 1927-1930. Edited by Rosser H. Taylor and Raven I. McDavid. (Columbia, South Carolina: The R. L. Bryan Company, 1938. Pp. xiv, 179. Frontispiece. $2.00.)

This book is a record of men and events as a former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of South Carolina recalled them. Judge Watts' memory took him back to the evil days of Reconstruction, to the Ku Klux Klan, to the election of 1876 when white supremacy was re-established in South Carolina by Wade Hampton, and to the Tillman Movement when Hampton and the social and political forces behind him were defeated and overthrown.

Laurens County, South Carolina, was the place of Judge Watts' birth and young manhood. Since few counties of the state had a more sensational history in the period of Reconstruction and since young Watts was an ardent Democrat and participant in those struggles, his memoirs are of value in clearing up some incidents of common gossip.

As a member of the general assembly and as a judge of both the Circuit and Supreme courts of the state, the author of the memoirs had a wide knowledge of public men and affairs. Few periods of the history of South Carolina were marked by greater personal bitterness than were the days of Ben Tillman's rule. Most, if not all, South Carolinians who can recall those days do so now without feeling. So it is a tribute to Judge Watts that, in spite of his adherence to the Tillman cause, he could retain the respect and admiration of his old friends who followed the conservative leadership.

Not the least of interest in the memoirs is the story of the author's judicial experiences, for he was noted for an almost unerring common sense in his interpretation and application of the law.

While the memoirs add little of new historical value, they bring a wealth of color by a most colorful public figure. The chief defect, as pointed out by the editors, is that they were dictated by the author to a stenographer, who failed to correct crudities of sentence structure and who misspelled words. But, as stated

folk. For the student of thought and affairs there is little here. There are brief references to such topics as the difficulties of the Spanish language, Europeans who speak three or four languages, bull fights, parties, Spanish wines and women, financial difficulties, mistreatment by the American consul, the slowness of Spanish life, and almost innumerable references to petty family affairs and local gossip. The statements of real historical importance could be condensed into half a dozen pages.

The title of the book, *Old Sherry,* apparently comes from Jerez, the town near Cadiz in which Wysor spent most of his time while in Spain. The English used to call it Sherry.

West Liberty State Teachers College C. C. REGIER

Memoirs of Richard Cannon Watts, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of South Carolina, 1927-1930. Edited by Rosser H. Taylor and Raven I. McDavid. (Columbia, South Carolina: The R. L. Bryan Company, 1938. Pp. xiv, 179. Frontispiece. $2.00.)

This book is a record of men and events as a former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of South Carolina recalled them. Judge Watts' memory took him back to the evil days of Reconstruction, to the Ku Klux Klan, to the election of 1876 when white supremacy was re-established in South Carolina by Wade Hampton, and to the Tillman Movement when Hampton and the social and political forces behind him were defeated and overthrown.

Laurens County, South Carolina, was the place of Judge Watts' birth and young manhood. Since few counties of the state had a more sensational history in the period of Reconstruction and since young Watts was an ardent Democrat and participant in those struggles, his memoirs are of value in clearing up some incidents of common gossip.

As a member of the general assembly and as a judge of both the Circuit and Supreme courts of the state, the author of the memoirs had a wide knowledge of public men and affairs. Few periods of the history of South Carolina were marked by greater personal bitterness than were the days of Ben Tillman's rule. Most, if not all, South Carolinians who can recall those days do so now without feeling. So it is a tribute to Judge Watts that, in spite of his adherence to the Tillman cause, he could retain the respect and admiration of his old friends who followed the conservative leadership.

Not the least of interest in the memoirs is the story of the author's judicial experiences, for he was noted for an almost unerring common sense in his interpretation and application of the law.

While the memoirs add little of new historical value, they bring a wealth of color by a most colorful public figure. The chief defect, as pointed out by the editors, is that they were dictated by the author to a stenographer, who failed to correct crudities of sentence structure and who misspelled words. But, as stated

in the editors' Notes, "an engaging conversationalist he [Judge Watts] certainly was; and, true to the traditions of the conversationalists of South Carolina, he has rambled delightfully, featuring many a rare personal experience and recording here and there judgments of men and events with keen and fresh philosophic insight."

The volume contains an appreciative introduction by Eugene S. Blease, the author's friend and associate on the South Carolina Supreme Court. And the editors have included at the end of the volume most excellent notes, without which the memoirs would be much less interesting and intelligible.

Clemson College ALESTER GARDEN HOLMES

A Second Constitution for the United States of America. By Hugh L. Hamilton. (Richmond: Garrett and Massie, Incorporated, 1938. Pp. viii, 166. $3.00.)

The expressed purpose of the author is missionary, to arouse a public demand for a constitutional convention to rewrite the national compact, which, in his opinion, is outmoded from preamble to last amendment. He contends that, though the technique of government has clearly "not kept pace with economic and social changes," neither the Congress nor the requisite two thirds of the state legislatures can be relied upon to initiate a call for a convention. Though he has no faith in politicians, he hopes that an aroused public opinion may prod the lawmakers into action. The reviewer, however, fears that the book will not carry far into the popular circle, and so will contribute little towards its objective.

The outstanding effect of the second constitution would be greater centralization of government in Washington. The states would become mere departments whose boundaries and even existence would be subject to the pleasure of the national assembly. This body, which would replace the Congress, would consist of a fascistic senate representing professional and industrial groups without regard to state lines and of a popular congress generally similar to the House of Representatives. The president would be elected by popular vote for a term of six years without re-eligibility. The senatorial term would be twelve years, and the congressional six years with eligibility for two terms. All civil officers and employees, except members of the supreme court and the cabinet, would be selected from civil service lists. The cabinet would be confined to the portfolios of state, treasury, war, justice, interior, post office, and budget. The vice-president would serve as postmaster general, the senate electing its own presiding officer. The supreme court would be fixed at nine members, would be freed from legislative regulation, and would share the right of impeachment with the congress. The senate would retain the sole power to try impeachments. The old *due process* clause would be so altered as to delete *life* and *property,* leaving only *liberty* to be guaranteed. As capital punishment would be abolished, the omission of *life* is immaterial; but what of *property?* Neutrality provisions

in the editors' Notes, "an engaging conversationalist he [Judge Watts] certainly was; and, true to the traditions of the conversationalists of South Carolina, he has rambled delightfully, featuring many a rare personal experience and recording here and there judgments of men and events with keen and fresh philosophic insight."

The volume contains an appreciative introduction by Eugene S. Blease, the author's friend and associate on the South Carolina Supreme Court. And the editors have included at the end of the volume most excellent notes, without which the memoirs would be much less interesting and intelligible.

Clemson College ALESTER GARDEN HOLMES

A Second Constitution for the United States of America. By Hugh L. Hamilton. (Richmond: Garrett and Massie, Incorporated, 1938. Pp. viii, 166. $3.00.)

The expressed purpose of the author is missionary, to arouse a public demand for a constitutional convention to rewrite the national compact, which, in his opinion, is outmoded from preamble to last amendment. He contends that, though the technique of government has clearly "not kept pace with economic and social changes," neither the Congress nor the requisite two thirds of the state legislatures can be relied upon to initiate a call for a convention. Though he has no faith in politicians, he hopes that an aroused public opinion may prod the lawmakers into action. The reviewer, however, fears that the book will not carry far into the popular circle, and so will contribute little towards its objective.

The outstanding effect of the second constitution would be greater centralization of government in Washington. The states would become mere departments whose boundaries and even existence would be subject to the pleasure of the national assembly. This body, which would replace the Congress, would consist of a fascistic senate representing professional and industrial groups without regard to state lines and of a popular congress generally similar to the House of Representatives. The president would be elected by popular vote for a term of six years without re-eligibility. The senatorial term would be twelve years, and the congressional six years with eligibility for two terms. All civil officers and employees, except members of the supreme court and the cabinet, would be selected from civil service lists. The cabinet would be confined to the portfolios of state, treasury, war, justice, interior, post office, and budget. The vice-president would serve as postmaster general, the senate electing its own presiding officer. The supreme court would be fixed at nine members, would be freed from legislative regulation, and would share the right of impeachment with the congress. The senate would retain the sole power to try impeachments. The old *due process* clause would be so altered as to delete *life* and *property,* leaving only *liberty* to be guaranteed. As capital punishment would be abolished, the omission of *life* is immaterial; but what of *property?* Neutrality provisions

would amount almost to a quarantine of the belligerents. Numerous moot questions would be set at rest, for a time at any rate, by redefinitions. In some changes new difficulties and ambiguities are plainly discernible. In all, 112 out of 149 clauses would be altered or abandoned and 18 entirely new ones added. Mr. Hamilton believes that his proposed social contract would assure "more perfect representation, more equitable justice, more contented liberty, real security, and peace," and would point the way to " 'The United States of the World.' " Though the reviewer sees considerable merit in many of the proposed changes, he is unable to share such faith.

Augusta, Georgia. WILLIAM M. ROBINSON, JR.

Historical News and Notices

Members of the Southern Historical Association may be justly proud of the organization's rapid approach to maturity. The annual report of the Secretary-Treasurer, printed in this issue, shows a total membership of over 800 and a cash balance of nearly $5,000. The Association is growing at the rate of about 100 a year; its financial reserve has continued to increase in spite of its assumption of a larger proportion of publication costs. Furthermore, there is tangible evidence that the Association, through its *Journal* and its annual meetings, is achieving its major objective, the development of Southern historical scholarship. A secondary purpose, "to foster the teaching and study of all branches of history in the South," has temporarily lapsed. A session of the first annual meeting was devoted to a discussion of "A New Introductory Course in the Social Sciences." The second annual meeting included a session program which bridged the gap between "Europe and the South." Subsequently the programs have dealt entirely with Southern history. The committee on program for 1938 endeavored to include papers on European history, but finally decided it was inadvisable to arrange such a session for the New Orleans meeting. We are assured, however, that historians working in other fields than American history will find it worthwhile to attend the fifth annual meeting which will convene in Lexington, Kentucky, some time in November, 1939 (see the report of the Secretary-Treasurer, pp. 76-77).

The following committee appointments have been announced by Charles S. Sydnor, president of the Association. *Committee on program:* James W. Patton, Converse College, chairman; Fred C. Cole, Louisiana State University; Robert S. Cotterill, Florida State College for Women; Stanley J. Folmsbee, University of Tennessee; Henry H. Simms, Ohio State University. *Committee on nominations:* Charles W. Ramsdell, University of Texas, chairman; William G. Bean, Washington and Lee University; Minnie Clare Boyd, Mississippi State College for Women; J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, University of North Carolina; Rosser H. Taylor, Furman University. *Committee on membership:* Alfred J. Hanna, Rollins College, chairman. *Committee on local arrangements:* Thomas D. Clark, University of Kentucky, and F. Garvin Davenport, Transylvania College, co-chairmen.

The Southern Historical Association has accepted an invitation to participate in the program of the thirty-second annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley His-

torical Association, which is to be held in Memphis, Tennessee, April 20-22. A joint session has been arranged for Saturday morning, April 22, on the general theme of "Town Life in the Ante-Bellum South," in which a paper will be presented by Mack Swearingen, Georgia State College for Women, on New Orleans; one by F. Garvin Davenport, Transylvania College, on Nashville; and one by Gerald M. Capers, Jr., Yale University, on Memphis. Plans are also being made for a joint dinner to be held on Friday evening, April 21.

PERSONAL

The Commonwealth Foundation Lectures at University College, University of London, will be delivered by Dwight L. Dumond of the University of Michigan during February and March, 1939.

Roger W. Shugg of Princeton University has been granted a postdoctoral fellowship for 1938-1939 by the Social Science Research Council to investigate social consequences of American industrialization at the London School of Economics and Political Science. Professor Shugg spent the past summer in Germany and Italy.

An exchange has been arranged between Walter B. Posey of Birmingham-Southern College and Charles E. Hunter of the University of Hawaii for the session of 1939-1940.

Mrs. Mary R. Campbell of Maryville College was adjudged the winner of the McClung Award for 1938. The award is a cash prize of fifty dollars given annually by Mrs. C. M. McClung of Knoxville to the contributor of the best article in each year's issue of the East Tennessee Historical Society *Publications*. Dr. Campbell's contribution to *Publications* No. 10 is entitled "Tennessee and the Union, 1847-1861." James C. Malin of the University of Kansas, P. L. Rainwater, director of the Historical Records Survey, Jackson, Mississippi, and Charles S. Sydnor of Duke University were the judges.

Hunter D. Farish, director of the Department of Research and Records, Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated, will serve as visiting professor of history at the College of William and Mary during the second semester of the current year. He will offer a course in Colonial American history.

The Eighth International Congress of Historical Sciences, held at Zurich August 28 to September 4, was attended by Joseph C. Robert of Duke University and Josiah C. Russell of the University of North Carolina. Professor Russell presented a paper on the "Decline in Population, 200-700 A. D., and Its Intellectual and Social Results," and presided at a session of the section on "Social and Economic History of Medieval and Modern Times." The recipient of a grant-in-aid from the American Philosophical Society, he is remaining in England for the current year to study the population of medieval England.

The death of Samuel A'Court Ashe of Raleigh, North Carolina, will recall his pioneer activities in preserving the history of the Old North State. As a Confederate soldier, member of the legal profession, newspaper editor, industrial executive, clerk of the United States District Court at Raleigh, and historian, his varied career spanned ninety-eight years. In the historical field he edited a *Biographical History of North Carolina,* 8 volumes, and wrote a *History of North Carolina,* 2 volumes.

W. H. Callcott of the University of South Carolina lectured before the Winter Institute of Hispanic-American Studies at Miami during January.

The appointment of William J. Van Schreeven as principal archivist of Virginia became effective January 1. Mr. Van Schreeven did graduate work at the University of Iowa and at Columbia University, where he is a doctoral candidate with a dissertation on Henry Clay as secretary of state. He has served as a classifier in The National Archives.

Summer research activities were carried on by C. P. West of Wake Forest College on the social life of the early Plymouth colony, and by W. C. Askew of the University of Arkansas on the development of public opinion in England, 1870-1914, at the British Museum. During the approaching summer, Cary Johnson of the University of Virginia will be engaged in research on the early history of Nashville.

David W. Lattimer of Ohio State University has been appointed instructor in history at the University of Tennessee for the winter and spring quarters of the current year to replace Maria M. Massey who is on leave of absence.

The following academic promotions have been called to the *Journal's* attention: Roger W. Shugg to be assistant professor of history at Princeton University; Ross H. Moore to be professor of history at Millsaps College; John E. Townes to be associate professor of history at the Virginia Military Institute; L. Walter Seegers to be assistant professor of history at the North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering; Harold L. Fowler to be associate professor of history at the College of William and Mary; Ruth Stephens to be assistant professor of history and political science at the University of Tennessee.

Among new appointments in the historical profession the following may be noted: Mack Swearingen to be chairman of the division of social sciences and head of the history department at the Georgia State College for Women; G. Leighton LaFuze to be professor of history and political science at John B. Stetson University; William E. Dodd to be research professor of American history and Solon J. Buck lecturer on American history at American University; George E. Mowry and Judson C. Ward to be instructors in history at the University of North Carolina; David M. Potter to be instructor in history at Rice Institute.

The following summer school appointments for 1939 have been announced: W. G. Bean of Washington and Lee University and Minnie Clare Boyd of the Mississippi State College for Women to teach at the University of Alabama; R. H. Wienefield of the University of South Carolina to teach at Johns Hopkins University; Thornton Terhune of Tulane University to teach at the University of Virginia; P. L. Rainwater to teach at the University of Texas (second term).

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The Southern Historical Association held a joint session with the American Historical Association at Chicago on the afternoon of December 30. Philip M. Hamer of The National Archives presided; Robert D. Meade of Randolph-Macon Woman's College read a paper on "Jefferson Davis and Judah P. Benjamin: Some New Light on the Working of the Confederate Machine"; Alfred J. Hanna of Rollins College discussed "The Flight of the Confederate Cabinet"; and Dallas D. Irvine of The National Archives presented some "Notes on the Fate of the Confederate Archives."

Aspects of Southern history were also treated in other sessions of the meeting. Walter P. Webb, University of Texas, read a paper on "The 'New' South and the Share-Croppers," and H. C. Nixon, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, led a discussion of Professor Webb's paper. At a joint session of the American Historical Association and the Agricultural History Society, Edwin A. Davis, Louisiana State University, presented a paper on "Bennett H. Barrow, Typical Ante-Bellum Planter of the Felicianas." C. C. Crittenden, North Carolina Historical Commission, discussed "Historical Agencies and Societies in the South" before a joint session of the American Historical Association and the Conference of State and Local Historical Societies. "The Abolitionist Movement Reconsidered" was the subject of a paper read by W. B. Hesseltine, University of Wisconsin. It elicited a lively discussion led by Theodore Clarke Smith, Williams College. Two papers read at a joint session of the American and the Mississippi Valley Historical associations dealt with the antislavery movement: "Daniel Howell Hise, Free-Thinker and Abolitionist," by Lewis E. Atherton, University of Missouri; and "The American Missionary Association as an Anti-Slavery Society," by Robert S. Fletcher, Oberlin College, in collaboration with Lloyd V. Hennings, Whitehouse (Ohio) High School. A luncheon conference of the Agricultural History Society was addressed by B. I. Wiley, University of Mississippi. His subject was "Salient Changes in Southern Agriculture Since the Civil War."

The Florida Historical Society assembled on January 25-26, 1938, for its thirty-sixth annual meeting. The sessions of the first day were held in St. Petersburg; those of the second convened in Tampa. Exhibits of Floridiana were on display at St. Petersburg Junior College and the University of Tampa. A program, prepared by a committee headed by Alfred J. Hanna of Rollins College, resulted in the Society's "most successful annual meeting."

Among the principal speakers were: T. Frederick Davis, Jacksonville, who spoke on "What the Disston Land Purchase Did for Florida"; Mrs. Ruth Cutter Nash, University of Chicago, "Florida, Pre-History and Anthropology"; Mrs. Doris Stone, Tulane University, "The Relationship of Middle America to Florida Archaeology"; Emily M. Porter, Apalachicola, "The St. Joseph Convention—Florida's First Step Toward Statehood"; Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings and Eustace L. Adams, "Use of Florida History Materials by Creative Writers"; and Luther H. Evans, "Historical Records Survey, and Union Catalog of Floridiana."

The following officers were chosen: Joshua Coffin Chase of Winter Park, president; Kathryn T. Abbey, Florida State College for Women, first vice-president; Spessard L. Holland, Bartow, second vice-president; Herbert Lamson, Jacksonville, recording secretary; Watt Marchman, Winter Park, corresponding secretary and librarian; Dorothy Dodd, Jacksonville, treasurer.

A district meeting of the Society was held jointly with the Tallahassee Historical Society in Tallahassee on May 21, in celebration of the centennial of the Episcopal Diocese of Florida. The program was presided over by Dr. Abbey, and included a welcome by Guyte P. McCord, president of the Tallahassee Historical Society, and papers on "Economic Conditions in Florida, 1840-1860," by Hugh M. Taylor, Quincy; "Florida Historical Society, Its History, Plans, Purposes," by Watt Marchman; "History of the Episcopal Church in Florida," by Herbert Lamson; and "A Church Inventory Under the Supervision of the Historical Records Survey," by Mrs. Sue A. Mahorner, Jacksonville.

The annual banquet of the East Tennessee Historical Society was held at Knoxville on October 7, 1938. Daniel M. Robison of Vanderbilt University delivered an address on "Whigs in the Politics of the Confederacy," and John P. Brown of Chattanooga made a short talk on "The Removal of the Cherokee Indians from Tennessee," in commemoration of the one hundreth anniversary of this removal.

The Alabama Department of Archives and History has been recently presented with the John K. McEwin Collection of aboriginal and pioneer relics. This collection has been brought together during a period of about forty-five years and includes a very fine group of aboriginal objects. It is especially rich in pipes. Also included are representative trade objects illustrative both of the South Atlantic and Pensacola merchants who sold to the Coosa River Indians of the central part of the state. Glass beads, bottles, and silver pendants and gorgets make up much of this character of material.

The Mississippi Department of Archives and History, with the help of the Historical Records Survey, is compiling for publication a checklist of the department's newspapers, a guide to its manuscripts, a bibliography of the publications of the state government of Mississippi, and a bibliography of Mississippiana.

The thirty-eighth annual meeting of the State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina assembled in Raleigh, December 1-2. At the opening session, Jonathan Daniels, editor of the Raleigh *News and Observer* and president of the Association, delivered an address on Thomas Wolfe and his work, and George Stevens, editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature,* spoke on book reviewing. Archibald Henderson reviewed North Carolina books and authors of 1938 at a morning session on December 2, followed by a discussion of the expediency of inaugurating a society for the preservation of the state's antiquities. Announcement was made at the final session that Mr. Daniels had been awarded the Mayflower Cup for 1938 for his book, *A Southerner Discovers the South.* Count René Doynel de Saint-Quentin, French ambassador to the United States, delivered an address on the first representative of his country to the United States, Conrad Alexandre Gerard.

Officers for 1939 were elected: president, A. R. Newsome of the University of North Carolina; first vice-president, Mrs. Marian Sims of Charlotte; second vice-president, Judge Heriot Clarkson of Raleigh; third vice-president, Richard D. Dixon of Edenton; secretary, C. C. Crittenden of the North Carolina Historical Commission, Raleigh.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

The Louisiana State University Press announces the inauguration of a Southern Biography Series, the first volumes of which will probably appear in the fall of 1939. The Series will be edited by Wendell H. Stephenson and Fred C. Cole, and will embrace economic as well as political biography. It is intended to appeal to the general reader as well as to the professional historian. Studies of prominent Southerners who have not hitherto received adequate biographical treatment and those for whom the discovery of new materials warrant a re-evaluation will be considered for publication.

The University of Alabama Library has recently acquired the Thomas Payne Thompson Collection of Americana, relating principally to the Mississippi Valley. It contains some 10,000 pieces, among them manuscripts, maps, letters, pamphlets, magazines, books, and portraits. Included in the collection are travel books, memoirs, and histories, published in France during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, that depict life in the Mississippi Valley and along the Gulf Coast during the era of French control; much material of similar nature for the Spanish and English periods; and diaries, memoirs, and works of prominent Americans. Much of the material pertains to the political, social, and economic life of the Old South, including plantations and slavery. There are many religious tracts and sermons. Outside the field of history, the collection contains material relating to law, medicine, the biological sciences, geology, engineering, modern languages, education, music, art, sports, and amusements.

During recent months the University of Virginia has acquired 83 autographed

letters of Thomas Jefferson, most of them addressed to Joseph C. Cabell; and 14 letters written by French officials to Arthur Lee in the years 1778-1780. By purchase from the Fairfax Harrison estate the University has completed its set of photostatic copies of the unpublished executive journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia.

The Richard T. Ely Collection, recently acquired by the Louisiana State University Library, represents a lifetime of assembling materials in economics and the other social sciences by a noted economist. The collection consists of about 7,500 volumes of books, 10,000 pamphlets, and a large assemblage of public documents, parchment deeds and charters, and journals. There are some 1,200 to 1,500 volumes in the rarer portion restricted to economic and political theory, covering practically all of the writers in these fields. Many of the great classics are in first edition, and some contain autographed letters of the authors, adding much to their interest. Among some of these rarities are Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations,* 2 vols. (London, 1776), Thomas R. Malthus' *Principles of Population* (London, 1798), and the writings of Arthur Young, William Godwin, and Matthew and H. C. Carey. There are two incunabula in the collection, an Albertus Magnus *Compendium theological veritatis* (Hamburg, 1489), and a Boethius *De consolatione philosophie* (Nürnberg, 1486). Much economic and social history is included, and the collection is especially strong on religious and communistic societies. Arthur Young's *Annals of Agriculture,* Emma Goldman's *Mother Earth,* and the *Fabian Tracts* are among the rare journals or society publications. The collection is now being processed and made available for use. Taken as a whole, it is the most valuable single addition made to the Louisiana State University Library.

The Mississippi Department of Archives and History announces the following recent acquisitions: Order Book of the Fourth Brigade of Mississippi militia (later state troops), September 17, 1862-May 2, 1863; a collection of 21 manuscripts and 10 printed pieces (July 8, 1864-May 1, 1865) pertaining to Major General W. W. Loring's division, Brigadier General W. S. Featherston's brigade, and General Joseph E. Johnston's surrender in North Carolina; copies of the journal of Rev. James A. Lyon of Columbus, Mississippi, 1861-1870; selections from the correspondence of John Sharp Williams and Woodrow Wilson, and selected speeches of Williams, compiled by George C. Osborn.

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following may be noted: six papers of Daniel O. Dunham, relating to trading companies in the Northwest, 1813; papers of Cadmus M. Wilcox, 1862-1865; diaries of Frank Wigglesworth Clarke, 30 volumes, 1865 to 1931; papers of Philippe Bunau-Varilla, relating to Panama, 1903-1904; papers of Alfred Thayer Mahan; additional papers of Elihu Root; papers of Boris Brasol, 36 boxes; additional papers on Negro history.

The Library of the University of Arkansas has completed its files of the *Annual Register* from 1754 to 1910, and hopes to bring it to date very soon.

Letters of the Choctaw chief, Hon. Gilbert W. Dukes, written in Choctaw and English, have been received by the Oklahoma Historical Society.

Dr. William E. Howard of Dallas, Texas, has presented his collection of Texana and Mexicana to the Dallas Historical Society "on condition that it be displayed permanently as a unit in the [Society's] Hall of State." The collection "consists of approximately two thousand books on Texas, about twelve thousand pamphlets on Texas, and approximately twenty-five hundred old documents, letters, and manuscripts entirely relative to the history of Texas, largely prior to the year 1845."

The National Archives has recently received from the adjutant general's office the manuscript documents and maps used in compiling the *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies;* the records of the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands, 1865-1872; correspondence and other papers of the secretary of war and of the headquarters of the army, 1800-1903; original muster rolls, 1818-1865, and strength returns, 1812-1898, of volunteer troops in various wars; and original records of discontinued military posts, units, and geographical commands, 1835-1912. Selected military, geographical exploration, and survey maps, most of them between 1789 and 1894, are being transferred from the office of the chief of engineers to The National Archives.

Resources of Southern Libraries: A Survey of Facilities for Research (Chicago: American Library Association, 1938, pp. xii, 370, $4.50), edited by Robert B. Downs, is a work which will give very practical assistance to historians of the South. The committee of the American Library Association which sponsored the survey had the following "specific objectives" in mind; "(1) to provide a basis for interlibrary loans; (2) to assist scholars and advanced students to find the best collections in their fields; (3) to give a basis for planning, as in agreements to divide acquisition activities; (4) to aid national and regional union catalogs; (5) to locate and describe little-known collections of value for research; (6) to discover particular weaknesses in libraries of the southern area; and (7) to stimulate the development of research collections" (p. xii). Among the chapters which should be of special interest to historians are those on government publications, manuscripts, newspapers, general periodicals and society publications, history, and the social sciences.

History of Colquitt County (Atlanta: Foote and Davies Company, 1937, pp. xiv, 365, $3.65), by W. A. Covington, is a record of the Moultrie region in Georgia. Chapters on the chronological development of the county are interspersed with topical discussions of institutional life. There are sundry compila-

tions including a population enumeration from the census of 1860, county officials, and World War veterans.

The work of the Historical Records Survey of the WPA continues to bear fruit in printed and mimeographed inventories of county archives, samples of which have reached the *Journal* office. The *Historical Records of North Carolina,* Vol. II, *The County Records, Craven through Moore* (Raleigh: North Carolina Historical Commission, 1938, pp. xii, 568), edited by Charles C. Crittenden and Dan Lacy, embraces the inventories of forty additional counties. An *Inventory of the County Archives of Virginia, No. 21, Chesterfield County* (Charlottesville: The University of Virginia, 1938, pp. viii, 229), prepared under the supervision of the state director, Elizabeth B. Parker, contains an historical sketch, a discussion of "The Evolution of County Government in Virginia" by Lester J. Cappon, sections on the keeping of records and their housing, care, and accessibility, inventories of the records of the several county offices, a bibliography, etc. Practically the same organization is given to the *Inventory of Parish Archives of Louisiana, No. 35, Natchitoches Parish* (University, Louisiana: Department of Archives, 1938, pp. vi, 180), compiled under the direction of John C. L. Andreassen. All three of the above inventories contain subject indexes; the last two have in addition chronological indexes.

Dallas T. Herndon of the Arkansas History Commission has compiled the *Arkansas Handbook, 1937-1938,* which contains "the background of personalities making up the governmental officials of the time"; an outline of the high-points in the state's history; and a unique feature, an "Arkansas Catechism," resulting from questions most frequently posed for the commission.

Lexington during the Civil War (Lexington: Commercial Printing Company, 1938, pp. 51, illustrations, $1.00), by J. Winston Coleman, Jr., depicts the divided sentiments of the people of Lexington, "capital" of the Kentucky Bluegrass region, during four years of fratricidal strife. The town was occupied by Federal soldiers almost continuously, although on three occasions it fell into Confederate hands. Military activities are emphasized, but there are also valuable notes on such subjects as Transylvania University, the activities of Lexington women, business conditions, and the arrival of refugees from East Tennessee.

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"The Democratic Societies and the Whiskey Insurrection," by William Miller, in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (July).

"Art and Artists in Baltimore," by Latrobe Weston, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (September).

"Benjamin Henry Latrobe: Descent and Works," by Ferdinand C. Latrobe, II, *ibid.*

"Ships and Shipping of Seventeenth Century Maryland," by V. J. Wyckoff, *ibid.* (December).

"Negroes in Richmond in 1864," by H. J. Eckenrode, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (July).

"New Light on George Washington's Ancestors," by S. H. Lee Washington, *ibid.*

"Two of the Oldest Brick Dwellings in America," by Anne Floyd Upshur and Ralph T. Whitelaw, *ibid.*

"John Taylor of Caroline and the Preservation of an Old Social Order," by Bernard Drell, *ibid.* (October).

"Washington's Burgess Route," by Arthur P. Gray, *ibid.*

"The Colonial Churches of Lynnhaven Parish, Princess Anne County, Virginia," by George Carrington Mason, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (July).

"The Old Bay Line of the Chesapeake. A Sketch of a Hundred Years of Steamboat Operation," by Alexander C. Brown, *ibid.* (October).

"Henrico and Its College," by Robert Hunt Land, *ibid.*

"The Identity of John White Governor of Roanoke and John White the Artist," by William P. Cumming, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July).

"Two Reconstruction Impeachments," by Cortez A. M. Ewing, *ibid.*

"George Edmund Badger, His Last Years in the United States Senate, 1851-1855," by Lawrence F. London, *ibid.*

"Progress in the North Carolina-South Carolina Boundary Dispute," by Marvin L. Skaggs, *ibid.* (October).

"Report on the Survey of Federal Archives in North Carolina, Through June 30, 1937," by Mattie Erma Edwards, *ibid.*

"George Edmund Badger, Member of the Harrison-Tyler Cabinet, 1841," by Lawrence F. London, in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (July).

"Family Traditions of Tidewater North Carolina," by M. T. Plyer, *ibid.* (October).

"The Public Career of George Washington Campbell," by Weymouth T. Jordan, in the East Tennessee Historical Society's *Publications* (1938).

"Felix Grundy and the Depression of 1819 in Tennessee," by Joseph H. Parks, *ibid.*

"John Mitchel, the Irish Patriot, Resident of Tennessee," by Samuel C. Williams, *ibid.*

"The Early Press of Jonesboro," by Paul M. Fink, *ibid.*

"Tennessee and the Union, 1847-1861," by Mary R. Campbell, *ibid.*

"The Farmers' Alliance and the People's Party in Tennessee," by J. A. Sharp, *ibid.*

"Robert J. Breckinridge and the Year 1849," by Hambleton Tapp, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (July).

" 'Macedonia'—'The Church of Our Ancestors,' " by Sara Graves Clark, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (October).

"The Famous Falls of the Ohio Trip; Causes for Its Necessity, and Reason Why Daniel Boone Chose Michael Stoner to Be His Sole Companion," by Bess L. Hawthorne, *ibid.*

"St. Joseph, Missouri, As a Center of the Cattle Trade," by Frank S. Popplewell, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (July).

"The Evolution of a Frontier Society in Missouri, 1815-1828," II, by Hattie M. Anderson, *ibid;* III, *ibid.* (October).

"A Brief Sketch of the Development of Negro Education in St. Louis, Missouri," by J. W. Evans, in the *Journal of Negro Education* (October).

"How the Cherokees Acquired and Disposed of the Outlet," V, by Berlin B. Chapman, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (June).

"The Part Played by the Enslavement of the Indians in the Removal of the Tribes to Oklahoma," by Gerald Forbes, *ibid.*

"The Vigilantes in Early Beaver," by J. V. Frederick, *ibid.*

"The Founding of the Philosophical Society of Texas," by Herbert P. Gambrell, *ibid.*

"Nunih Waiya," by Anna Lewis, *ibid.*

"Governor Benjamin Franklin Overton and Governor Benjamin Crooks Burney," by John Bartlett Meserve, *ibid.*

"The Saga of Skullyville," by W. B. Morrison, *ibid.*

"Chief Lewis Downing and Chief Charles Thompson (Oochalata)," by John Bartlett Meserve, *ibid.* (September).

"Homesteading in Northwestern Oklahoma Territory," by Roscoe Harper, *ibid.*

"The Catholic Church on the Oklahoma Frontier," by Sister Ursula Thomas, in *Mid-America* (July).

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"State of the Province of Maryland in 1758," in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (September).

"An Account of the Collections of Indian Artifacts Belonging to the Maryland Historical Society," by William B. Marye, *ibid.*

"Rossburg Inn, Landmark of a National Route," by William F. Kellermann, *ibid.*

"Captain Phillip Taylor and Some of his Descendants," by Emerson B. Roberts, *ibid.*

"Private Manors: An Edited List," by Donnell MacClure Owings, *ibid.* (December).

"Notes on Augustine Herman's Map," contributed by Louis Dow Scisco, *ibid.*

"Bills for the Carpenter Work on 'Hampton,' " by William D. Hoyt, Jr., *ibid.*

"Letters of Charles Carroll, Barrister," continued, *ibid.*

"Documents Concerning Charles Willson Peale," *ibid.*

"The Washington Family and the Stuchbury Estate, Northhamptonshire," by W. R. Lidderdale Forrest, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (July).

"Notes from the Records of Stafford County, Virginia, Order Books," continued, *ibid.* (July, October).

"Diary of Col. William Bolling of Bolling Hall," continued, *ibid.*

"Letters from Old Trunks," continued, *ibid.*

"Orderly Book Virginia Militia, War of 1812," contributed by Mrs. William M. Sweeney, *ibid.*

"Montgomery County's Revolutionary Heritage," by Ruby A. Roberts, *ibid.*

"Letter of Martha Selden Jones," contributed by C. G. Chamberlayne, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (July).

"Gleanings from the Records of (Old) Rappahannock County and Essex County, Virginia," contributed by William M. Sweeney, *ibid.*

"The Peninsular Campaign—Letters to the Surgeon General of Massachusetts," contributed by F. W. Cross, *ibid.*

"Sergeant Champe's Adventure," by Wilbur C. Hall, *ibid.*

"Potomac River Maps of 1737, by Robert Brooke and Others," by James W. Foster, *ibid.* (October).

"The Compleat Housewife or Accomplish'd Gentlewoman's Companion," by Genevieve Yost, *ibid.*

"Immigration Between Virginia and Maryland in the Seventeenth Century," by John B. C. Nicklin, *ibid.*

"Arnold Guyot's Notes on the Geography of the Mountain District of Western North Carolina," edited by Myron A. Avery and Kenneth S. Boardman, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July).

"William Maclean's Travel Journal from Lincolnton, North Carolina, to Nashville, Tennessee, May-June, 1811," edited by Alice Barnwell Keith, *ibid.* (October).

"Letters from John Rhea to Thomas Jefferson and James Madison," edited by James A. Padgett, in the East Tennessee Historical Society's *Publications* (1938).

"Papers from the Spanish Archives Relating to Tennessee and the Old Southwest, 1783-1800: II, 1786," translated and edited by D. C. Corbitt and Roberta Corbitt, *ibid.*

"Writings on Tennessee History, 1937," compiled by Laura E. Luttrell, *ibid.*

"John D. Shane's Notes on an Interview with Jeptha Kemper of Montgomery County," transcribed by Lucien Beckner, in the *Filson Club Historical Quarterly* (July).

"Browsing in Our Archives; Two Letters by Cassius M. Clay, 1862 and 1869," by Otto A. Rothert, *ibid.*

"John Filson's Narrative of His Defeat on the Wabash, 1786," edited by Leonard C. Helderman, *ibid.* (October).

"Letters by Rafinesque to Dr. Short in the Filson Club Archives," transcribed, with an introduction, by Samuel E. Perkins, III, *ibid.*

"Whitley Papers, Volume 9—Draper Manuscripts—Kentucky Papers," edited by Bayless Hardin, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (July).

"The Letters of Hubbard Taylor to President James Madison," continued, edited by James A. Padgett, *ibid.*

"Trial List of Titles of Kentucky Newspapers and Periodicals Before 1860," compiled by Kenneth W. Rawings, *ibid.*

"Kentucky Marriages and Obituaries," continued, compiled and edited by G. Glenn Clift, *ibid.* (July, October).

"The Letters of Colonel Richard Taylor and of Commodore Richard Taylor to James Madison, together with a Sketch of Their Lives," by James A. Padgett, *ibid.* (October).

"Letters of George Caleb Bingham to James S. Rollins," IV, edited by C. B. Rollins, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (July); V, *ibid.* (October).

"The War of 1812 on the Missouri Frontier," I, by Kate L. Gregg, *ibid.* (October).

"Notes of a Missionary Among the Cherokees," edited by Grant Foreman, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (June).

"Excitement on the Sweetwater," edited by W. S. Nye, *ibid.*

"Colonel A. W. Evans' Christmas Day Indian Fight (1868)," edited by C. C. Rister, *ibid.* (September).

"Colbert Ferry on Red River, Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory; Recollections of John Malcolm, Pioneer Ferryman," recorded by W. B. Morrison, *ibid.*

"Unratified Treaty with the Creeks, 1868," edited by Berlin B. Chapman, *ibid.*

"Sources for the Study of Oklahoma Catholic Missions: A Critical Bibliography," by Sister M. Ursula, *ibid.*

"The Catholic Church on the Oklahoma Frontier; A Critical Bibliography," *id.*, in *Mid-America* (July).

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"A Study of Rev. Robert Finley, D. D.," by Arch W. Carswell, in the New Jersey Historical Society, *Proceedings* (July).

"The Voluntary Exile of Free Negroes of Pensacola," by Ruth B. Barr and Modeste Hargis, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (July).

"Transportation in Territorial Florida," by Alice Whitman, *ibid.*

"The Historical Records Survey and State Archives Survey of Florida," *ibid.*

"Florida's First Constitution," by James B. Whitfield, *ibid.* (October).

"St. Joseph, An Episode of the Economic and Political History of Florida," by James O. Knauss, *ibid.*

"The Reception of the St. Joseph Constitution," by Emily Porter, *ibid.*

"The St. Joseph Convention: The Making of Florida's First Constitution," IV, by F. W. Hoskins, *ibid.*

"Stephen Elliot, First Bishop of Georgia," by Edgar L. Pennington, in *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (September).

"A Georgia Planter and His Plantation, 1837-1861," by Dorothy Seay Magoffin, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (October).

"Ambrose Baber," by R. B. Flanders, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (September).

"St. Simons Island during the War between the States," by George Alexander Heard, *ibid.*

"Plantation Development in Chatham County," by Savannah Unit, Federal Writers Project, *ibid.* (December).

"A Georgia Medical Student in the Year 1801," by Victor H. Bassett, *ibid.*

"Dungeness," by B. N. Nightingale, *ibid.*

"Arsène Lacarrière Latour," by Edwin H. Carpenter, Jr., in the *Hispanic American Historical Review* (May).

"French Charities to the Acadians, 1755-1799," by Shelby T. McCloy, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (July).

"Consuls of Spain in New Orleans, 1804-1821," by Stanley Faye, *ibid.*

"Pensacola and the Filibusters, 1816-1817," by Harris Gaylord Warren, *ibid.*

"Protestant Beginning in New Orleans," by John K. Bettersworth, *ibid.*

" 'The World's Delight': The Story of Adah Isaacs Menken," by John S. Kendall, *ibid.*

"The Papers of the Food Administration for Louisiana, 1917-1919, in the National Archives," by William D. Cain, *ibid.*

"Annual Meeting of Southern Historical Association," by Fred Cole, *ibid.* (October).

"The Free Negro in New Orleans, 1803-1860," by James E. Winston, *ibid.*

"Magnolia Plantation, 1852-1862: A Decade of a Louisiana Sugar Estate," by J. Carlisle Sitterson, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (September).

"Laredo during the Texas Republic," by Seb. S. Wilcox, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (October).

"Louis Aury: The First Governor of Texas Under the Mexican Republic," by Lancaster E. Dabney, *ibid.*

"Two WPA Projects of Historical Interest," by A. W. von Struve, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"Letters from Robert Mills," contributed by Richard Xavier Evans, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).

"Journal of General Peter Horry," continued, edited by A. S. Salley, *ibid.* (July, October).

"Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette, Charleston, S. C.," continued, contributed by Elizabeth Heyward Jervey, *ibid.*

"The Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1765-1775," continued, contributed by Mabel L. Webber, copied by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*

"Letters from Dr. Benjamin Rush of Philadelphia to Wm. Allston Esq of South Carolina," contributed by Alston Deas, *ibid.* (October).

"An Unpublished Letter of George Washington," contributed by Dixon Wecter, *ibid.*

"A Map of the Road from Pensacola to St. Augustine, 1778," by Mark F. Boyd, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (July).

"The Panton, Leslie Papers: Letters of *Edmund Doyle,* Trader, 1814," *ibid.*

"A St. Joseph Diary of 1839," edited by F. W. Hoskins, *ibid.* (October).

"Seven Unpublished Letters of Paul Hamilton Hayne," edited by William Stanley Hoole, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (September).

"Papers Relating to the Georgia-Florida Frontier, 1784-1800," VIII, edited and translated by D. C. Corbitt, *ibid.;* IX, *ibid.* (December).

"Old Canoochee Backwoods Sketches," III, by Julia E. Harn, *ibid.* (September); IV, *ibid.* (December).

"The Will of Dr. John Joachim Zubly," edited by Charles C. Cordle, *ibid.*

"The Expense Account of a Grande Dame of French Colonial Louisiana," by Edith Dart Price, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (July).

"Grenier's Journal of His Voyage to Vera Cruz, 1745," edited by Charmion Clair Shelby, *ibid.*

"Appointment of Members of the Superior Council in Louisiana, in 1762," edited by Henry P. Dart, *ibid.*

"La Dame de Ste. Hermine," by Edith Dart Price and Sally Dart, *ibid.*

"A Sale of Real Property in Louisiana in 1769," edited by Henry P. Dart, *ibid.*

"Official Records of the West Florida Revolution and Republic," edited by James A. Padgett, *ibid.*

"Records of the Superior Council of Louisiana," LXXVI, continued, edited by Heloise H. Cruzat, marginal notes by Henry P. Dart, revised by Walter Prichard, *ibid;* LXXVII, continued, *ibid.* (October).

"Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana," LVIII, continued, edited by Laura L. Porteous, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.* (July); LIX, continued, *ibid.* (October).

"Ship Lists of Passengers Leaving France for Louisiana, 1718-1724," translated by Albert Laplace Dart, *ibid.*

"Inventory of the Paris Duvernay Concession in Louisiana, 1726," edited by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*

"Lease of a Louisiana Plantation and Slaves, 1727," edited by *id., ibid.*

"Decision Day in the Superior Council of Louisiana, March 5, 1746," edited by Henry P. Dart, *ibid.*

"Commission, Orders and Instructions Issued to George Johnstone, British Governor of West Florida, 1763-1767," edited by James A. Padgett, *ibid.*

"The Garden of Fray Antonio De Sedella," edited by Stanley Faye, *ibid.*

"Documents Relating to the Establishment of Privateers at Galveston, 1816-1817," translated and edited by Harris Gaylord Warren, *ibid.*

"A Tourist's Description of Louisiana in 1860," edited by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*

"Colonel J. K. F. Mansfield's Report of the Inspection of the Department of Texas in 1856," edited by M. L. Crimmins, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (October).

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES AND COMPILATIONS

"The Use of the Term Copperhead during the Civil War," by Charles H. Coleman, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (September).

"Polk and Fremont, 1845-1846," by Richard R. Stenberg, in the *Pacific Historical Review* (September).

"The Tariff Issue and the Civil War," by Richard Hofstadter, in the *American Historical Review* (October).

"Slavery and the Civil War," by Avery Craven, in the *Southern Review* (Autumn).

"S. C. Pomeroy and the New England Emigrant Aid Company, 1854-1858," by Edgar Langsdorf, in the *Kansas Historical Quarterly* (August).

"Letters of a Drummer Boy," edited by Don Russell, in the *Indiana Magazine of History* (September).

"William J. Kountz, General McClellan's Superintendent of River Transportation, 1861-62," by Theodore R. Parker, in the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* (December).

"The Diary of James M. Doyle," edited by Jerome V. Jacobsen, in *Mid-America* (October).

"Rise of Teacher-Training for Negroes," by Reid E. Jackson, in the *Journal of Negro Education* (October).

"Plantation Masters," by E. T. H. Shaffer, in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (October).

"The Merchant Sutler in the Pre-Civil War Period," by Lewis E. Atherton, in the *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* (September).

CONTRIBUTORS

PHILIP M. HAMER is chief of the Division of Reference, The National Archives.

F. GARVIN DAVENPORT is professor of history and political science at Transylvania College.

THOMAS D. CLARK is assistant professor of history at the University of Kentucky.

FRANCIS B. SIMKINS is professor of history at Virginia State Teachers College, Farmville.

PHILIP DAVIDSON is professor of history at Agnes Scott College.

FLETCHER M. GREEN is professor of history at the University of North Carolina.

CHARLES G. CORDLE is professor of history at the Junior College of Augusta, Georgia.

HENRY S. RORER is a member of the department of history, Maury High School, Norfolk, Virginia.

THE
SOUTHERN REVIEW
A Critical Quarterly

IN THE WINTER ISSUE

Reflections on the Russian Revolution, *Sidney Hook*
The Majority Principle and the Scientific Elite, *Willmoore Kendall*
Some Marxist Fallacies, *Henry Bamford Parkes*
Planned Economies of Truth, *Dixon Wecter*
Semantic and Poetic Meaning, *Kenneth Burke*

FICTION
Mrs. Ulysses and Son, *Michael Seide*
Love and James K. Polk, *Griffith Beems*
Without Gunfire, *Joseph Hopkins*

POETRY
Six Poems, *Randall Jarrell*

Poetic Drama in England Today, *Bonamy Dobrée*
Henry James and the Trapped Spectator, *L. C. Knights*
Proletarian Literature: A Political Autopsy, *Philip Rahv*

75c a copy **$3.00 a year**

Published by

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
UNIVERSITY, LA., U.S.A.

THE
PACIFIC HISTORICAL REVIEW

A scholarly journal devoted to the entire Pacific area

Official organ of the

PACIFIC COAST BRANCH OF THE AMERICAN
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

LOUIS KNOTT KOONTZ, *Managing Editor*
JOHN W. CAUGHEY, *Associate Editor*
334 Josiah Royce Hall, University of California at Los Angeles
Board of Editors: THOMAS A. BAILEY, DAN E. CLARK, WALTER N. SAGE,
JOHN C. PARISH, FREDERIC L. PAXSON, ROBERT T. POLLARD

Its current and back numbers contain a wealth of material on Australia and the Pacific islands, China and Japan, Alaska, the Canadian West, the American West, and the Pacific nations of Hispanic America.

Seventh year of publication

$4.00 per year

Published for the Pacific Coast Branch by
THE ARTHUR H. CLARK CO., GLENDALE, CAL.

William and Mary College Quarterly

Devoted to the publication of original contributions and documents relating to Virginia history

$1.00 A COPY . . . $4.00 A YEAR

●

THOROUGHLY INDEXED

Published Quarterly by
William and Mary College
at WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

Editors

JOHN STEWART BRYAN
President of William and Mary College

E. G. SWEM
Librarian, William and Mary College

SECESSION AND RESTORATION OF LOUISIANA

By W. M. CASKEY, PH.D.

An authoritative study of a bitter chapter in Louisiana's history—from the time of the state's secession in 1861 to the New Orleans Riot of 1866. ". . . a valuable contribution to Southern history."—AVERY CRAVEN.

"The book will take its place among the very best on Reconstruction."—FRANK LAWRENCE OWSLEY.

xii, 318 pages. Octavo. Cloth. Illustrated. $3.50

THE OTHER HALF OF OLD NEW ORLEANS

Edited by E. MERTON COULTER
Professor of History
University of Georgia

Sketches of Characters and Incidents from the Recorder's Court of New Orleans in the Eighteen Forties as Reported in the "Picayune."

These sketches present some of the humor typical of the Old Southwest and picture the more boisterous of Old New Orleans' 'other half.'

vii, 108 pages. Octavo. Illustrated. $2.00

Order from your
bookseller or direct from

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
UNIVERSITY o o o LOUISIANA

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

●

PRESIDENT

CHARLES S. SYDNOR, Duke University

VICE-PRESIDENT

FRANK L. OWSLEY, Vanderbilt University

SECRETARY-TREASURER

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL, University of Texas (1939)
THOMAS P. ABERNETHY, University of Virginia (1940)
PHILIP M. HAMER, The National Archives (1941)

MANAGING EDITOR

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

ELECTED MEMBERS

A. B. MOORE, University of Alabama (1939)
THOMAS S. STAPLES, Hendrix College (1939)
THOMAS D. CLARK, University of Kentucky (1940)
BENJAMIN B. KENDRICK, Woman's College of University of North Carolina (1940)
KATHRYN T. ABBEY, Florida State College for Women (1941)
AVERY O. CRAVEN, University of Chicago (1941)

The JOURNAL of SOUTHERN HISTORY

VOL. V MAY, 1939 No. 2



Published quarterly by the

SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME V | MAY, 1939 | NUMBER 2

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

BOARD OF EDITORS

JOHN D. BARNHART
Louisiana State University

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL
University of Texas

AVERY O. CRAVEN
University of Chicago

WALTER B. POSEY
Birmingham-Southern College

WILLIAM O. LYNCH
Indiana University

PHILIP DAVIDSON
Agnes Scott College

FRANK L. OWSLEY
Vanderbilt University

W. NEIL FRANKLIN
The National Archives

MANAGING EDITOR
WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE
FRED C. COLE, Louisiana State University

GUARANTOR
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Louisiana State University, University, Louisiana.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

The Journal of Southern History
VOLUME V MAY, 1939 NUMBER 2



Copyright, 1939, by the Southern Historical Association

CONTENTS

The Contribution of Walter Lynwood Fleming to Southern Scholarship. By William C. Binkley 143

Southern Investments in Northern Lands before the Civil War. By Paul Wallace Gates 155

"The First Northern Victory." By Fred Harvey Harrington 186

The Slave Insurrection Panic of 1856. By Harvey Wish 206

Notes and Documents

Slater Fund Beginnings: Letters from General Agent Atticus G. Haygood to Rutherford B. Hayes. Edited by Curtis W. Garrison 223

A Canadian View of Parties and Issues on the Eve of the Civil War. Edited by James J. Talman 245

Book Reviews

Spruill, *Women's Life and Work in the Southern Colonies,* by Philip Davidson 254

Semmes, *Crime and Punishment in Early Maryland,* by Wesley Frank Craven 255

Chumbley, *Colonial Justice in Virginia: The Development of a Judicial System, Typical Laws and Cases of the Period,* by Wesley Frank Craven 255

Bean, *The Peopling of Virginia,* by Richard L. Morton 257

Burns, *James Madison: Philosopher of the Constitution,* by Jennings B. Sanders 258

Williams and Barker, *The Writings of Sam Houston, 1813-1863,* I, by William C. Binkley 259

Windrow, *John Berrien Lindsley: Educator, Physician, Social Philosopher,* by F. Garvin Davenport 261

Dumond, *Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1831-1857,* I and II, by Frank L. Owsley 263

Coulter, *The Other Half of Old New Orleans,* by Edward Everett Dale 264

Carroll, *Slave Insurrections in the United States, 1800-1865,* by Harvey Wish 265

Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism,* by W. Darrell Overdyke 266

Caskey, *Secession and Restoration of Louisiana,* by Ella Lonn 268

Hanna, *Flight into Oblivion,* by Edwin Adams Davis 269

Acheson, *35,000 Days in Texas: A History of the Dallas News and Its Forbears,* by H. Bailey Carroll 270

Gobbel, *Church-State Relationships in Education in North Carolina Since 1776,* by H. E. Spence 272

Gallagher, *American Caste and the Negro College,* by Rupert B. Vance 273

Historical News and Notices 275

Personal 275

Historical Societies 277

Bibliographical 278

Contributors 287

The Contribution of Walter Lynwood Fleming to Southern Scholarship

By WILLIAM C. BINKLEY

It is hardly necessary to point out to this group[1] that any attempt to appraise the work of a man of our own generation must be made on a tentative basis. I suspect that a roll call of the members of this audience would reveal the fact that a majority knew Walter Lynwood Fleming personally, and that an imposing proportion could express a sense of obligation to him for assistance, encouragement, and inspiration. In spite of the lack of a long-time perspective on his work, however, there is a valid reason for including him for consideration in any program which deals with historians of the South. When it is realized that no less than ten books and one hundred and sixty-six articles and reviews published since 1901 are the product of his pen,[2] it becomes clear that if considered from the point of view of quantity alone, his work could not be ignored. Add to this the fact that every item published by him had a direct bearing on Southern history, and that he himself, by deliberate choice, spent his entire professional career in the South, and it becomes apparent that he belongs definitely to the Southern group. But the historian is probably more interested in the quality of his scholarship than in its quantity; and he will desire also to know something of the contribution made by the man, not only through his writings, but also through his administrative work and his personal influence on others.

[1] This paper was presented as part of a program on "Historians and Economists of the South," at the fourth annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association, in New Orleans, November 5, 1938.

[2] For a complete bibliography of Fleming's published works, together with a sketch of his career, see Fletcher M. Green, "Walter Lynwood Fleming: Historian of Reconstruction," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), II (1936), 497-521.

Although this is intended to be a study of his contribution rather than of his life, it seems necessary to present a brief biographical sketch to serve as the background. Born in 1874 in southeastern Alabama, he grew up on a farm and attended the Alabama Polytechnic Institute at Auburn, where he received the bachelor's degree in 1896 and the master's degree in 1897. From 1896 to 1900, he served as librarian and instructor in English at Auburn, except for a brief period of service in the Spanish American War in 1898-1899, where he rose quickly from private to commissioned officer and brigade quartermaster. From 1900 to 1904, he was a graduate student at Columbia University, serving also as a part-time lecturer. He received the Ph.D. degree in history in 1904 and for the next three years was professor of history at West Virginia University. From 1907 to 1917 he was professor of history at Louisiana State University and in 1917 became professor of history at Vanderbilt University, where he served also, after 1923, as dean of the College of Arts and Science and chairman of the Social Science Division until failing health forced his retirement in 1929. From that time until his death, in 1932, illness made work impossible for him.

It is perhaps presumptuous for one who knew him only during these closing years to attempt a portrayal of his character for those who were intimately associated with him during his active work, and yet, for those who did not know him, the picture is not complete without some mention of his magnetic personality and his happy, friendly, and helpful disposition. He was a man of powerful physique who never took physical exercise (he frequently remarked that he had had his share of exercise as a growing boy and young man on the farm). He was unostentatious in bearing, but energetic and aggressive mentally. He possessed a keen sense of humor, an incisive and acquisitive intellect, and a spirit of tolerance. He was straightforward and honest in his dealings with others, but was impatient of mediocrity, pettiness, and indirection, and could be blunt and emphatic when the occasion demanded. He inspired confidence, and he had all the qualities of a born leader as long as he was sitting at a desk or a conference table. As soon as he got on his feet for an extemporaneous speech, no matter how brief, he became

so completely self-conscious that he was never able to speak clearly or effectively. For that reason, he consistently declined to accept invitations to speak, and pushed others forward to appear before the public in various capacities where he himself would have been expected to serve. In spite of this shortcoming, however, he won the admiration and respect of all with whom he was associated. The following quotation from an editorial in the Nashville *Banner* at the time of his death indicates the impression that he made on at least one individual. "Educator, scholar, and gentleman of the highest type, though he was, Dean Fleming's paramount achievement rested largely in his humanness. In him the true end of learning found its fullest expression. Everything he thought or expressed was tempered with the human attitude, and even when his mind was fully occupied with the most pressing of problems, he was never too busy to sit down for an informal chat with anyone who came to his office."[3]

On the score of scholarship, perhaps the first fact to be emphasized is the breadth of his training and his interests. As a student at Auburn, he had the good fortune to work under Professor George Petrie, who has recently been characterized as one of the greatest teachers that the South has produced.[4] In going on from Auburn to Columbia, he carried Petrie's inspiration, and William A. Dunning supplemented this with his own inspirational teaching and guidance. Fleming recognized his debt to these two men by dedicating his two-volume *Documentary History of Reconstruction* to them jointly. But he also came under the influence of others at Columbia whose names stand high in the field of scholarship. Any man who had work under Herbert L. Osgood, James Harvey Robinson, and William M. Sloane in history, John W. Burgess and John Bassett Moore in government, Franklin H. Giddings in sociology, and Edwin R. A. Seligman in economics, was sure to come out, not with a mere formal training, but with an education which would lay the foundation for an appreciative approach to any phase of the broad

[3] Nashville *Banner,* August 4, 1932; quoted also in Green, "Walter Lynwood Fleming," *loc. cit.,* 503.

[4] See H. C. Nixon, "Colleges and Universities," in W. T. Couch (ed.), *Culture in the South* (Chapel Hill, 1935), 246.

field of culture. It is interesting to note that in both his writing and his teaching, Fleming showed unmistakable signs of having gained much from each of these men.

Anyone who undertakes to study Fleming's work as a scholar must begin by acknowledging indebtedness to Dr. Fletcher M. Green for his careful work in compiling a complete bibliography of Fleming's writings. As has been suggested, this list amounts to 176 items, exclusive of duplicates and reprints. It includes: six volumes of edited materials; four volumes as author, one of which was published posthumously; forty-four articles in professional journals; ten chapters in *The South in the Building of the Nation;* sixty sketches for encyclopedias, dictionaries, and other reference works; thirty-one book reviews; and twenty-one revisions and expansions of his earlier articles.

In order to distinguish, however, between quantity and quality, it is necessary to examine Fleming's more important works more or less critically. Three of his books may be said to stand out, not only in his own writing, but also in the broad field of American scholarship. His *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama,* published in 1905, was a development of his doctoral dissertation at Columbia, and it was immediately recognized as an outstanding contribution in the field of Southern history. One who reads it now is perhaps impressed by two characteristics. The first of these is the recurring evidence of Fleming's insight into broad problems of Southern history which led him to state generalizations more than thirty years ago which are now being tested and found sound in the light of careful research based on materials which were not known when Fleming wrote. A single illustration might be given in his statement that, "The effect of the abolition movement in the North was the destruction of the emancipation organizations in the South, and both friends and foes of the institution united on the defensive."[5] The student of American history who has followed the re-evaluation of the abolition movement during the past ten years is at once struck by the fact that the general conclusions now being formulated are in a sense simply a verification of this statement made by Fleming in 1905.

[5] *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama* (New York, 1905), 10.

The second striking characteristic of this book is the way in which it weaves the various threads of political, military, social, economic, educational, and religious problems into an integrated pattern which presents a composite picture of the whole society as a unit instead of leaving the reader looking at the individual threads lying side by side. When one recalls that the volumes of the *American Nation* series, being published at the same time, were making a great concession by including chapters on economic and social conditions without fitting them into the picture, the significance of Fleming's plan of organization becomes apparent. Here was a man just out of graduate school presenting in his doctoral dissertation the synthesis which had hitherto been expected only of experienced writers of general histories. Perhaps here were the individual influences of Dunning, Robinson, Burgess, Giddings, and Seligman being reflected collectively in the work of a man who had absorbed something from each of them.

In his next outstanding work, the *Documentary History of Reconstruction,* published in two volumes in 1906 and 1907, this same comprehensive plan was followed, with the result that one finds in it materials for the study of any aspect of the period covered. This book almost immediately became the most useful source book in that field of American history, both for classroom use and for research purposes, and the thirty years since its publication have not dimmed its value. It is perhaps significant that when, on rare occasions, a set falls into the hands of dealers it is priced at anywhere from fifty dollars upward.

His third outstanding work was the small volume in the *Chronicles of America* series, entitled *The Sequel of Appomattox.* Although forced by the requirements of the series to condense and to forego the use of extensive references, Fleming succeeded in this volume in presenting a synthesis of the ten years following the Civil War, not only in a charming style, but also in such a way as to meet the requirements of sound scholarship. In a sense, this might be considered as his own philosophy of Reconstruction, drawn from his earlier works, but it is actually more than that. It is an interpretation of the period.

One might take the time to examine all of Fleming's work carefully for the purpose of checking on his use of source materials, his method of citations, his application of principles of historical criticism, and his objectivity. If this were done, it seems safe to say that he would pass all such tests with colors flying. His *Documentary History* is itself source material, meticulously reproduced and carefully edited. The footnotes in his monographs show something like 90 per cent of references to primary materials, most of which had been used very little, if at all, when he wrote. His critical use of this material is clearly indicated in the information given concerning it both in the footnotes and in the text. For example, in discussing the growth of disaffection in North Alabama during the war, he summarizes the reports of two naval officers to the effect that the sentiment was overwhelmingly unionist, and says of one of them: "It may be that he mistook curiosity for 'Union' sentiment." He then adds: "Neither of these observers landed, and their observations were limited to the river banks."[6]

As for objectivity, it is, of course, extremely difficult to arrive at a final conclusion concerning the objectivity of any individual. In the first place, one must be sure of his own objectivity concerning the individual, and in the second place, he must answer the question as to whether the other fellow seems objective merely because his conclusions agree with one's own. It was probably more difficult for a Southerner to be objective about the Civil War and Reconstruction thirty years ago than now, and yet it can safely be asserted that Fleming, writing in the first decade of the twentieth century, was clearly more objective than many Southerners writing on Southern history in the fourth decade of the century. To claim that his sympathies were not with the South would be erroneous; but to say that he permitted those sympathies to undermine his objectivity would be misrepresentation. We know now that

[6] *Ibid.*, 116. This suggestion of a quizzical attitude toward these observers was characteristic of his method. That his ridicule was not always veiled, however, is shown in his comment that the Rev. A. S. Lakin "told several marvelous stories of his hairbreadth escapes from death by assassination which, if true, would be enough to ruin the reputation of northern Alabama men for marksmanship." *Sequel of Appomattox* (New Haven, 1921), 208. See, also, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama,* 639.

in most cases where he seemed to be critical of Reconstruction policies or practices, subsequent scholarship has substantiated the validity of his criticism.

It is only by rearranging the bibliography of his writings in chronological rather than alphabetical order, that one can obtain anything like an adequate conception of certain aspects of Fleming's work. Such an arrangement, for example, reveals unmistakable evidence of a gradual development of each hypothesis running through the sequence of his publications; and it becomes clear that he repeatedly tried out his materials in a tentative form before committing them to book form. For example, between 1901 and 1905, he published eighteen articles on various specific problems connected with the Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama, all of which were later to appear in either expanded or modified form in his book on that subject. He went farther than this, however, in showing that to him the mere publication of an article did not mean the completion of that particular study. For the average graduate student, the acceptance of an article for publication in the *American Historical Review* might have been construed as the attainment of finality on that subject; but not so for Fleming. In October, 1901, that journal published his article on "The Buford Expedition to Kansas," but three years later he published a revision of the study under the same title in the Alabama Historical Society *Transactions,* in which he added much new material and modified some of his earlier conclusions. One other case also deserves mention. In 1905, he presented a paper on the Freedmen's Savings Bank before the American Historical Association. In the following year, he published in the *Yale Review* an article in two parts on the same subject, in which he added materially to the earlier treatment, and in 1927 this twelve thousand word article was expanded into a thirty thousand word book in which he gives definite evidence of a willingness to change earlier conclusions or emphasis, and to supply additional information.

In fact, this practice illustrates his adherence to a conviction that the interests of historical scholarship could be better promoted by presenting tentative or preliminary conclusions from time to time than by waiting

until the last word could be said before putting anything into print. For this reason, one can use the year by year record of his publications as a forecast of his more important works. It is interesting to find that just as the series of articles before 1905 was pointing toward the publication of his *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama* and his *Documentary History of Reconstruction,* so, in 1908, there began to appear articles on various phases of the career of Jefferson Davis which marked the beginning of his plan to write a biography of the Confederate leader; a plan which, as you know, he did not succeed in carrying out, although he never gave up the idea. As late as 1928, in the last annual report which he made to Chancellor Kirkland at Vanderbilt University, he stated that he hoped to devote much of the next year to his biography of Davis, "on which," he said, "I have been at work for the last twenty years."

At one period he seems to have considered the possibility of a sociological and economic study of the New South, and it is interesting to find among the titles of his articles from 1905 to 1908 the following: "Immigration into the Southern States," "The Servant Problem in a Black Belt Village," "The Religious and Hospitable Rite of Feet Washing," "The Re-Organization of the Industrial System in Alabama," "Italian Farm Labor in the South," all of them either sociological or economic, rather than historical, in emphasis. One finds also that on turning in 1909 to the writing of a history of Louisiana State University, he began almost immediately to publish articles on special phases, and that one by-product took form in 1912 as the book on *General W. T. Sherman as College President.*

One other important fact becomes apparent from a chronological rather than an alphabetical arrangement of his publications. On the basis of the alphabetical list, the statement has been made that "with one or two exceptions all were written in the twenty-five years between 1903 and 1928."[7] A record of his published items arranged according to the years of publication reveals that out of a grand total of approximately five thousand printed pages of scholarly writings (exclusive of

[7] Green, "Walter Lynwood Fleming," *loc. cit.,* 521.

book reviews and reference sketches), slightly more than four thousand were published before 1913. In other words, instead of saying the twenty-five years from 1903 to 1928, one should really say the ten years from 1903 through 1912 for the publication of 80 per cent of his work. In fact, his total for the year 1905, alone, exceeds by nearly one hundred pages the total for the last fifteen years of his active life, even if we include the posthumously published *History of Louisiana State University.*

Just what this picture means, it would be difficult to say. One could compare the list through 1912, showing six volumes in book form and a flood of articles ranging from three to ten items a year, with the record of the fifteen years from 1913 through 1927, showing never more than one item per year and seven years with nothing appearing in print from his pen, and draw the conclusion that here was the picture of a man who had literally burned himself out intellectually within the space of ten years. In Fleming's case, however, this would not be a just conclusion. It is necessary to remember that by 1912 he had become recognized as one of the constructive leaders of the Louisiana State University faculty, and that he was being drawn more and more into administrative responsibilities. There seems to be something incompatible in the attempt to mix scholarship and administration. A sound scholar is concerned primarily with a conscientious attempt to obtain all the evidence on a given subject and to examine it carefully and critically before arriving at a conclusion. This means a deliberative, long-time process. The administrator, on the other hand, is called upon day after day to make decisions under stress, without having time to obtain all the evidence or even to reflect deliberately on that which he may have. It is the rare individual who can carry a program of scholarly research on one shoulder and the responsibility for meeting administrative emergencies on the other.

As Fleming was drawn more and more into administrative problems, he found it necessary to postpone again and again his proposed study on Jefferson Davis. That he, himself, realized the dilemma is shown by the fact that his willingness to leave Louisiana State University to go to

Vanderbilt in 1917 grew out of a conviction that he could not break away from administrative duties as long as he stayed at Baton Rouge, and that he could not proceed with his research interests as long as he was involved in administrative duties. The irony of the situation is apparent when one examines his career at Vanderbilt. Instead of getting away from administrative work, he found himself more deeply enmeshed than ever before; and it was not his nature to shun a task which he realized needed to be done. His real contribution at Vanderbilt, therefore, was not so much in the field of scholarship as in the field of administration, even though the primary objective of his administrative work was to improve the opportunities for scholarship at his institution. He sensed at once the serious shortcomings in the work in the social sciences at Vanderbilt and concentrated his attention first of all in strengthening the staff and the resources in that field, with the result that, at the end of his service, the staff had been increased from himself and two other men to a well-balanced group of twenty-one men in the Social Science Division.

He also became instrumental in promoting the development of the program of graduate work, and to him almost alone must go the credit for laying the foundation on which the present graduate school at Vanderbilt has been based. Through his ability to formulate reasonable but comprehensive plans, he was able to attract funds from the Rockefeller Foundation for improving the resources in the social sciences, while he also did as much as anyone to promote the development of the other broad fields of university work. It is too soon, of course, to attempt a final estimate of the importance to the South of his contribution in the field of administration, even if the proper person were at hand to undertake it.

On the score of scholarship and of inspiration, however, it may be safer to generalize on his influence. There can be little question of the permanence of his influence as a productive scholar. His published works alone assure this because of the objectivity of his method and the importance of his emphasis upon the interrelation of all aspects of Southern life. Here he not only set an example which is already being

followed by other historians of the region, but he also stated many of the general hypotheses on which they are working.

Somewhat less tangible, but none the less real, is the influence which he had in preparing others for work in the field. In order to understand the importance of this influence, it must be examined from a somewhat unorthodox point of view. In the first place, we have become so accustomed to estimating a man's influence on the next generation of scholarship by looking at the contributions of those who received their professional training under him, that we sometimes overlook another important consideration. We speak of "Dunning men," or "Turner men," for example, without stopping to ask where many of those men received the inspiration which sent them to Dunning or Turner. Who can say that Petrie made no contribution to historical scholarship because Fleming received his doctorate under Dunning? Without the Petries in numerous institutions whose resources do not permit the development of a graduate program, the graduate schools of the country might find it difficult to survive.

It was in this way that one of Fleming's most significant contributions was made. In fact, it is somewhat startling to realize that he never had an opportunity to direct the work of a graduate student through the Ph.D. program. The nearest approach was the late Carl Driver, who finished his dissertation shortly after Fleming's breakdown, and who survived his teacher by only four years. Thus, there is no man in the profession who can say, "I received my degree under Fleming," and yet letters on file in his personal correspondence show that there are dozens of men in university and college teaching and in research in the South who have testified that they received their initial interest in their work from the inspiration of his classroom or of informal conferences with him. Not only did he send men to graduate schools with their research projects already tentatively outlined, but as his plans for graduate work in his own institution began to materialize, the organization and direction of the program as a whole demanded so much of his attention that he found it necessary to turn over to his colleagues the direction of the students themselves. Yet it was he who selected the students,

advised them in choosing a field of research, and guided them to the men under whom they were to work; and, as long as he was active, it was to him that they went for advice and further inspiration, regardless of whether their field was history, literature, or the sciences.

A second important influence which he exerted upon the development of scholarship in the South is closely linked up with his administrative work; and here, too, the contribution can be understood best by departing from the traditional line of approach. The new generation of trained scholars is inclined to take the graduate school for granted, and it rarely stops to consider that men like Dunning and Turner could do what they did partly because the stage had already been set for them. But a generation ago no such stage existed in the South, with the result that many capable Southern men who were fortunate left the region for their graduate study and few came back, while many another, perhaps equally capable but less fortunate, was never able to reach the full height of his possibilities. Fleming was one of the few who came back, not of necessity but of deliberate choice; and he came back with a vision. For twenty years, he thought, talked, and planned for the development of centers for graduate study in the South. To say that he alone was responsible for the establishment of those graduate schools which now exist in the region would be claiming too much; but that he was one of the leaders in that farsighted group of pioneers who promoted the movement cannot be denied. Any attempt to measure the individual contribution of any member of the group would be as futile as to try to predict exactly what will be the cumulative effect of the movement itself upon the future civilization of the South.

Returning, therefore, to my opening statement that it is still too soon to attempt anything more than a tentative estimate of the importance of Fleming's work, I should like to close by suggesting that perhaps the clue to the ultimate appraisal will have to be found by following the plan which he himself used in his writings; that is, by looking at his scholarship, his inspirational influence, and his administrative program, not as unrelated units, but as the three principal elements whose interrelations will determine the final character of the pattern.

Southern Investments in Northern Lands before the Civil War

By PAUL WALLACE GATES

Investments by the people of one section of the United States in the enterprises of other sections is a phase of American economic history that has been little studied.[1] Northern investments in Southern and Western states have received some attention but they deserve further examination. That Southern[2] capital in considerable amounts was invested in public lands of the Northwestern states will come to many as a surprise. The amount of this investment and the fact that it was made by the people of a section ordinarily thought to have no surplus capital should warrant some study.[3]

The ante-bellum South could easily have absorbed all the funds owned by its residents. The new cotton, rice, and sugar producing areas, the railroad[4] and canal companies, banking, commerce, and manufacturing

[1] Acknowledgment is made to the Social Science Research Council for the financial aid which made possible the research for this article.

[2] It is understood that the terms "South" and "Southern" as used in this article refer to that section below the Mason and Dixon Line.

[3] Southern investments in Northern securities—except securities of land companies—are not considered in this study, but it is only fair to point out that such investments were made. Southerners in 1820 owned over one half the stock in the second United States Bank which was held privately in the United States. In 1832 the South's share in the Bank was valued at $10,000,000. Ralph C. H. Catterall, *Second Bank of the United States* (Chicago, 1903), 508. Representative Thomas H. Bayley of Virginia and Corcoran and Riggs of Washington held considerable blocks of Illinois bonds, and James S. Easley of Virginia, in addition to large land investments in the Northwest, instructed his agent to invest collections in the stock of the La Crosse and Milwaukee Railroad. Bayley to Corcoran and Riggs, November 4, 1852; Winslow and Lanier and Company to *id.*, November 25, 26, 28, December 19, 1851, Corcoran MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); James S. Easley to Peters, Campbell and Company, October 6, 1857, Easley Letter Books, Easley MSS. (University of Virginia Library).

[4] Thomas P. Kettell pointed out in 1860 that capital was accumulating in the South and

all called for additional capital and promised, perhaps, as much security and as good returns as investments in land in the Northwest. Despite such local needs many residents of the older Southern states and, indeed, of some of the newer slave states turned their backs upon their section and invested their surplus funds in the rapidly growing commonwealths north of the Ohio.

There were three major periods during which the fever of land speculation swept over the country: 1816-1819, 1833-1837, and 1854-1857. In the first period it was Alabama and Ohio that chiefly attracted speculators; in the second period, Michigan, Mississippi, Illinois, and Indiana; and in the third, Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Missouri. Although there was a large investment of Virginia and Kentucky capital in the Virginia Military Tract of Ohio before 1820,[5] Southern investments in Northern lands were made chiefly in the two later periods. The following indictment of the speculative craze of the thirties was penned by William J. Grayson of South Carolina who, in 1836, participated in the mad rush for land in Indiana:[6]

> The restless spirit which had threatened to overthrow the republic took a new direction, and displayed itself in another form. A rage for speculating in land sprang up and extended over the whole country. Men, women, and children, clergy and laity, plunged into the current flowing with promises of universal wealth. The mania raged for a year or two, until the recurrence of a commercial crisis, with its customary thunders and lightnings, purified the atmosphere, and left all parties astonished, dismayed and ruined.

Outstanding among the intersectional investments were those made by three large planters of Virginia, South Carolina, and Louisiana. The

that the railroads in that area, unlike those in the West, had been constructed with local funds. *Southern Wealth and Northern Profits* . . . (New York, 1860), 50, 88, 98, 137-38. It appears that this was not true of the Charleston and Hamburg Railroad for which a loan of $2,000,000 was negotiated in England in 1838. Cincinnati *Chronicle,* quoted in *Indiana Farmer* (Indianapolis, 1837-1841), II (1838), 68.

[5] William T. Hutchinson, "The Bounty Lands of the American Revolution in Ohio," MSS. (University of Chicago Library).

[6] William J. Grayson, *James Louis Petigru* (New York, 1866), 135-36. While a member of Congress, Grayson invested $10,000 in Indiana lands through Henry L. Ellsworth, one of the largest individual owners of prairie lands in the Northwest. Some 7,000 acres in northern Indiana, most of which was in Benton County, were bought. Sales were slow

Cabell family possessed wide estates in the Old Dominion and one of its members—Landon Rose Cabell[7]—invested a large sum in Indiana lands in 1835. In association with Henry L. Brooke, a distinguished member of the Richmond bar, and Philip M. Tabb,[8] Cabell bought 22,500 acres[9] at the auction sale at La Porte where the lands of northwestern Indiana were for the first time made available for purchase. To this sale came many Indiana bankers prepared to snap up likely sections or to lend their funds to squatters at the usual frontier interest rates of 24 to 48 per cent. Henry L. Ellsworth,[10] Federal commissioner of patents and one of Indiana's great land barons, Henry King,[11] Pennsylvania capitalist, and that most denounced of frontier characters, the "loan shark," in the person of Lyne Starling,[12] formerly of Kentucky, were also in attendance. The rush for land and the presence of so many competing capitalists aroused keen excitement and raised the selling price well above normal. The three Virginia associates had to pay as high as $9.05 per acre for some tracts although the average was about $1.75.[13] Their investment was a pure speculation and none of the three apparently intended to settle upon the lands. They made a contract with Jesse Roberts of St. Joseph, Missouri, for the management of their property. Roberts undertook to prevent trespass and pillage and to effect sales,

and in 1850, despairing of a better bargain, Grayson sold his interest to Ellsworth for $13,312. Benton County (Indiana) Deed Records, II.

[7] Alexander Brown, *The Cabells and their Kin* (Boston, 1895), 397.

[8] "First real estate commission contract, dated September 26, 1836, recorded November 23, 1836, Stark County Records," William H. Mathew Notes, MSS. (Indiana State Library).

[9] All details of land entries in this article, unless otherwise stated, are compiled from the entry books, too numerous to list here, in the general land office, department of the interior. The principal types of entry books are the cash, military warrants, and scrip abstracts.

[10] Claribel R. Barnett, "Henry Leavitt Ellsworth," in *Dictionary of American Biography,* 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), VI, 110-11.

[11] *The Biographical Encyclopedia of Pennsylvania of the Nineteenth Century* (Philadelphia, 1874), 17.

[12] Henry Howe, *Historical Collections of Ohio,* 2 vols. (Norwalk, Ohio, 1896-1898), I, 649.

[13] The Indianapolis *Indiana Democrat,* October 14, 1835, spoke of the "immense crowd" which attended the sale and added, "the settlers generally got their homes at or near congress price." On February 15, 1837, it observed that much of the 474,000 acres sold in the district in the previous year went into the hands of speculators.

in return for which he would receive one fourth of all proceeds, after deducting costs and interest. The lands selected by Cabell and his associates were doubtless representative of the area but they probably needed draining before they could be farmed or sold and the price paid for them was not justified, as subsequent events were to show. Ten years later much of the land was tax delinquent and advertised for sale.[14]

In the same year that Cabell and his associates plunged so heavily in Indiana land, Wade Hampton (1791-1858),[15] owner of cotton plantations in both the tidewater and piedmont sections of his native state as well as sugar plantations in Louisiana, made a modest investment in Wisconsin. In October and November, he attended the sales at Green Bay and entered 2,080 acres.

The newer South also provided the funds for a large intersectional investment made by a Louisiana planter, E. E. Malhiot. An exile from Canada because of his participation in the Rebellion of 1837, he established himself in the Parish of Assumption on Bayou Lafourche, where he acquired and developed an extensive sugar plantation. Malhiot won the confidence and respect of the "Cajuns" among whom he settled and was elected by them in 1856 to the Louisiana Senate.[16] Not content with his sugar plantation, he undertook in the same year to establish a modified form of a Canadian seigniory in central Illinois. From the Illinois Central Railroad he bought 22,000 acres of land upon which he colonized a hundred or more families of French Canadians. The settlement was a success but Malhiot's trials with his tenants and with his railroad creditor were many and lengthy. Until his death he continued to manage his varied interests in Louisiana and Illinois.[17] The Civil War did not prevent him from operating his estates both in the Union and in the

[14] Supplement to the *St. Joseph Valley Register,* undated (Indiana State Library).

[15] J. Harold Easterby, "Wade Hampton," in *Dictionary of American Biography,* VIII, 213-15.

[16] Ivanhoe Caron, "Eduard-Elisee Malhiot," in Royal Society of Canada, *Proceedings and Transactions* (Ottawa, Montreal, 1882-), 3rd Ser., XXII (1928), sec. 1, pp. 155-66.

[17] Paul W. Gates, *The Illinois Central Railroad and its Colonization Work* (Cambridge, 1934), 131, 236-38, 296.

Confederacy,[18] and his property in neither camp was threatened with confiscation as were the Northern possessions of many Southerners.

Although much of the domestic and foreign trade of the ante-bellum South was in the hands of outsiders, there were numerous Southern fortunes made in commerce. In Baltimore,[19] in the early part of the nineteenth century, the firm of William Wilson and Sons owned a fleet of ships engaged in trade with China, India, Europe, and South America. "This eminent shipping firm,"[20] experiencing the same decline in profits which affected the New England-China trade, gradually withdrew from commerce and invested its funds in banking, local real estate, and Western lands. In 1836 it bought 3,776 acres in the Springfield, Illinois, district. James B. Danforth, who had a wholesale and merchandising business in Louisville, Kentucky, also made a speculation in Illinois. Instead of buying land, Danforth subscribed $10,000 to the capital stock of the New York and Boston Illinois Land Company[21] which was organized in 1835 to buy and sell lands in the Military Tract of Illinois. This company, of which Danforth was a trustee, claimed to own 900,000 acres.

Before 1850 there was perhaps no state in which so much absentee-owned capital had been invested as in Illinois, and certainly in no part of that state except the Military Tract was there a greater concentration of "alien" ownership than in the Springfield land district. Between 1833 and 1837 over 7,000,000 acres were sold in this district, a large proportion of which was bought by nonresidents. Many Southerners in addition to the firm of William Wilson and Sons were attracted to the Springfield district. Some of the purchases made by Southerners are listed below:[22]

[18] W. H. Osborn to General W. K. Strong, March 29, 1862, and *id.* to J. M. Douglass, "Presidents' Letters" (Sixty-third Street Archives, Illinois Central Railroad, Chicago).

[19] Another Baltimore resident not elsewhere mentioned in this article who bought land in the Northwest was John M. Gordon who entered 6,764 acres in Michigan in 1836.

[20] George W. Howard, *The Monumental City. Its Past History and Present Resources* (Baltimore, 1873-1880), 470-71.

[21] *Articles of Association of the New York and Boston Illinois Land Company: Amendments . . .* (Philadelphia, 1839); J. Stoddard Johnston, *Memorial History of Louisville,* 2 vols. (Chicago, n.d. [1896?]), I, 383, 397.

[22] Compiled from abstracts of Springfield land office.

Name	*Residence*	*Year*	*Acres*
William Brown	Harrison County, Kentucky	1833	4000
Drury J. Field	Fayette County, Tennessee	1836	8414
Field and Holloway	Richmond County, Kentucky	1836	1611
Robert Goggin	Madison County, Kentucky	1836	1566
Henry H. Hall	Accomac County, Virginia	1833-34	5080
Daniel Huey	Mississippi	1835	4220
Mayer and Harwood	Baltimore, Maryland	1836	1293
James Ross	Montgomery County, Tennessee	1835	1360
Nathaniel A. Ware[23]		1833	21400
Isaac Williams	Huntsville, Alabama	1835	1480
David Zeller	Washington County, Maryland	1835	2169

Perhaps the most fortunate Southern investment in this district was made in 1836 for the estate of A. Hamilton, formerly of Bath County, Kentucky. John and Joseph Berry, likewise of Bath County, entered some 7,353 acres in the Springfield district of which 4,161 acres in Sangamon County were entered for the Hamilton estate. The title to the 4,161 acres was in dispute between the Hamilton and Berry heirs until 1876 when George H. and James C. Hamilton were awarded the entire tract with reasonable expenses to the Berrys for their management.[24] The following year the tract was sold to William Scully, the greatest landlord in Illinois, for $215,297.[25] The Berrys kept a part of their other entries as late as 1894 at which time they held at least 1,783 acres in Sangamon County.[26]

The extent of early North Carolina commerce, we are now told, has been underestimated by historians.[27] Certainly one North Carolinian, Miles White,[28] who moved to Elizabeth City in 1830, built up a "large coasting and West India trade" from which he made a comfortable fortune. In 1849 he retired from shipping and moved to Baltimore where

[23] Ware is variously listed in the Sangamon County Deed Records from St. Louis, Natchez, and Hinds County, Mississippi.

[24] 43 Mortgage Record, Sangamon County, Register of Deeds Office, 563.

[25] 61 Deed Record, *loc. cit.*, 11.

[26] *The Plat Book of Sangamon County, Illinois* (Chicago, 1894), shows Joseph A. Berry owning 1,491 acres, John S. Berry 193 acres, and J. H. Berry 199 acres.

[27] Charles C. Crittenden, *The Commerce of North Carolina, 1763-1789* (New Haven, 1936), 72 *et passim.*

[28] Howard, *Monumental City,* 628-30; Henry Hall, *America's Successful Men of Affairs,* 2 vols. (New York, 1895-1896), II, 861.

he engaged in the land business. White and his son Elias purchased extensive Baltimore property, but more interesting for our purposes are their Western land ventures. From 1849 to 1860 they spent a good deal of their time in Iowa and other Northwestern states looking over lands for investments, lending money to desperate squatters who stood to lose their homes at the approaching sales unless they could borrow sufficient to buy their claims, and making agreements with local agents to look after their lands, pay the taxes, collect payments, and reinvest receipts. Their total entries made for themselves and others approximated 175,000 acres and literally dot the abstract books of the land offices of Iowa, where the largest proportion was made. The risks were great and the profits high, in good times, but the panic of 1857 and the resulting depression made it difficult for the claim holders to meet their payments and in many cases they not only defaulted on their contracts but abandoned their claims. However, Iowa lands have generally been a good investment and the Whites did not have to wait long before their holdings were again in demand. Like so many other absentee speculators, the Whites fared badly in Wisconsin where they entered some 12,000 acres.[29] Their agent proved untrustworthy, neglected their lands, and permitted them to go to tax sale.[30]

Perhaps the largest land business in the South and one of the most significant in the entire country was operated by Easley and Willingham of Halifax Court House, Virginia, a few miles from the North Carolina line. James S. Easley, the more active partner in the land business, was a member of the merchandising and importing firm of Easley and Holt, the funds and credit of which were used by Easley and Willingham to deal extensively in lands. It was not the simple act of buying lands in

[29] There is considerable correspondence concerning White's ventures in Wisconsin lands in the Woodman MSS. (Wisconsin State Historical Society Library).

[30] The Whites have remained in the Western land business to this day. The business passed from Miles and Elias White to Francis White and from him to Miles White, Jr., who still manages the "few scattered lots" remaining. Miles White, Jr., to the writer, Baltimore, Maryland, September 21, 1937. White has an extensive collection of documents dealing with the family land business. Included therein are the sales books, tax books, tax receipts, and a large amount of miscellaneous material concerned with the land affairs. Towards the latter part of the century, the sale of city lots in numerous Western cities seemed to be almost as important to the Whites as was the disposal of their farm lands.

advance of settlement and holding them for a profitable sale that attracted them, although they did speculate in this manner. They also purchased military land warrants in the East and resold them through their Western agents for a quick profit. The largest and most lucrative part of their business was the entering of lands for squatters who had made some improvements upon their claims. Either through their numerous Western agents, or personally on their frequent trips through the Western states, Easley and Willingham contracted with some 2,000 squatters to enter their lands for them on what they called the "time entry" business. The title was taken in the firm's name and the contract provided for the payment at the end of one year of $140 for 80 acres, $210 for 120 acres, and $280 for 160 acres. The squatter also had to pay the land office fees. Where the partners contracted directly with the squatters for their entries, and payments were made promptly at the end of the year, the profit might run as high as 75 per cent;[31] where the business was conducted through an agent $10 might be allowed as compensation, but some agents insisted on an equal division of the profits after the firm had charged 10 per cent interest on the warrant, thereby reducing the latter's profit to a mere 42 per cent. It may have been of Easley and Willingham that a local historian wrote:[32]

> . . . many of the early settlers were not men of great financial standing. . . . and to procure their homes they would permit Mr. Shylock to enter the land in his own name, and . . . the settler would repurchase it . . . [from] the money lender, allowing and promising him forty per cent per annum on the $200 until paid . . . . the money-lender who had come west with a pocket full of land warrants, which had cost him ninety cents an acre, if the squatter paid at the end of two and a half years, was getting $400 for an outlay of $144. That these entries would be eaten up by usury and tax was most evident, unless the location was of such character and worth as to command an immediate sale, which in the fewer instances happened, but in the most cases, the land remained in the name of the party furnishing the warrants for entry.

During the years 1852 to 1857 Easley and Willingham's Western land business prospered and their profits were reinvested in additional lands.

[31] The claims were entered with military warrants, the market price of which ranged from 90 cents to $1.15 for most of the period.

[32] Joe H. Smith, *History of Harrison County, Iowa* (Des Moines, 1888), 100.

They also invested substantial sums for or in co-operation with other Virginians, notably Daniel B. Easley, brother of James, John D. Holt, Thomas Leigh, Thomas E. Owens, Evan Raglund, and George Carrington. Altogether this group entered upwards of 350,000 acres in Iowa, Missouri, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Kansas, and Nebraska, a volume of entries probably exceeding that made by any similar group before the Civil War. The panic of 1857 slowed up their operations; squatters defaulted, payments became delinquent, credit extensions had to be made, and in many cases the lands were abandoned by their tenants. This Virginia group thus became one of the largest landholders in the above mentioned states, excluding of course the land grant railroads, and the land business absorbed its attention throughout the century.[33]

In the mid-nineteenth century the loose banking laws which prevailed made it easy for people with some influence but little capital to establish banks of deposit, the funds of which were available for investment in speculative enterprises. It is not surprising, therefore, that numerous Southern bankers, attracted by the high interest rates and profits in land speculation, invested no small portion of their funds in Northern lands. The investments of the banking firm of Pairo and Nourse of Washington illustrate this tendency. In the early fifties, Charles Pairo entered either personally or through agents 40,000 acres of land in sixteen districts in the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, and in the territories of Kansas and Nebraska. Such far-flung activities made supervision difficult. But worse still, Pairo overextended his investments, and when payments and sales declined in 1857, the firm was forced to suspend. Its balance sheet showed liabilities of $200,000 and assets of $413,000 of which $218,000 was in Western lands.[34] The failure of this firm led the *National Intelligencer* to reflect upon the evils of speculation and to warn other institutions against "a further indulgence in Western lands."[35]

The suspension of Pairo and Nourse led to runs on other Washington

[33] This account is based on a large collection of manuscripts of James Stone Easley and of the firm of Easley and Willingham in the Library of the University of Virginia.

[34] Washington *National Intelligencer,* September 15-19, 1857.

[35] *Ibid.,* September 19, 1857.

banks, especially that of Sweeny, Rittenhouse, and Fant, which dealt in land warrants and lent money for land investments in Kansas. Hamilton G. Fant of this firm had not only lent money on Kansas land at 50 per cent interest but also had purchased Leavenworth lots through his Western agent, Thomas Ewing, Jr.[36] The firm also co-operated with E. L. Fant and Company of Lecompton, Kansas.[37] The banking house of William T. Smithson of Washington was likewise dealing in land warrants and Western lands. In 1856 it advertised to buy "150,000 acres of land warrants for which . . . [it would] pay the highest market price."[38] The following year it advertised for sale "several thousand acres of fine lands" in Iowa and thirty or forty lots in Chicago.[39] Although forced to curtail operations by the panic of 1857, these firms remained solvent during the ensuing depression.[40]

The most influential Washington banker and the most inveterate land speculator was William W. Corcoran.[41] Through his intimate relations with prominent Democratic politicians, among them Robert J. Walker, Jesse Bright, Stephen A. Douglas, R. M. T. Hunter, and John Forney, Corcoran received from the Polk, Pierce, and Buchanan administrations many favors, the greatest of which was the financing of the government's Mexican War loans. Corcoran invested a portion of the profits from these banking and brokerage plums in numerous land speculations. Over a period of years the treasury department had accumulated unde-

[36] Thomas Ewing, Jr., to H. B. Denman, Leavenworth, Kansas, July 21, 1857, and *id.* to Fant, Ewing Letter Books (in possession of Thomas Ewing, Jr.). This collection contains considerable correspondence on the investments of Hamilton G. Fant in and around the growing city of Leavenworth.

[37] Advertisement of E. L. Fant, Jr., and Company, Washington *National Intelligencer,* March 18, 1857.

[38] *Ibid.,* December 24, 1856.

[39] *Ibid.,* March 16, 1857.

[40] John Underwood of Washington, like Fant and Smithson, dealt extensively in land warrants which he was prepared to sell or locate on Wisconsin lands. In 1850 he sent thirty 160 acre warrants to Albert W. Parris, his Wisconsin agent, for location or sale. John Underwood to Moses M. Strong, Washington, December 28, 1850, Strong MSS. (Wisconsin State Historical Society Library). Underwood also made an investment in lands in Indiana with H. L. Ellsworth.

[41] The sketch of Corcoran by William B. King, in *Dictionary of American Biography,* IV, 440-41, is conventional and trite. The author did not even list, to say nothing of using, the great collection of Corcoran MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

veloped lands, town lots, and other miscellaneous property through forfeiture by defaulting Federal officers, such as Samuel Swartwout, and their bondsmen. Many of these defalcations came to light during the panic of 1837 but it was not until 1847 that business conditions justified the government in offering the property for sale. Press advertisements gave descriptions of the lands and invited bids for them.[42] Corcoran, who was a large creditor of Secretary of the Treasury Walker, submitted bids ranging from 2 cents per acre for 45,000 acres of Texas lands to 38 cents per acre for 15,800 acres in Mississippi, 22,000 in Illinois, 2,240 in Michigan, and 41 cents for 2,800 in Indiana, and was generally successful against competitors who might bid higher for small portions of individual lots.[43] In addition to getting title to 103,000 acres of land, he secured lots in eight cities, among them New York. Most valuable were the lands in Illinois[44] which within a few years were selling for $5 and $10 per acre. Unfortunately for Corcoran, the quitclaim title which the government gave him was defective since the dower rights of the wives of the defaulted officers or their bondsmen had not been conveyed, and this defect created many difficulties in the management of the lands. So many title controversies arose that he feared in 1857 he would never recover "cost and interest."[45] Notwithstanding his early fears, his agent valued the remaining unsold lands acquired at a cost of less than $25,000 at $578,033, of which title to lands valued at $159,145 was clear.[46]

[42] Washington *National Intelligencer,* August 24, 1847.

[43] All bids are found in the "Bid Book," archives, Solicitor's Office, Treasury Department, Washington.

[44] Corcoran had earlier engaged in a land venture in Illinois with Amos Kendall which, by 1853, was producing considerable in the form of rents. With money furnished by Corcoran, 1,580 acres were purchased privately in 1839 in Sangamon, Logan, and Menard counties. The lands were subsequently divided, Corcoran keeping his for the rents he received and Kendall selling his share in the fifties and sixties for as high as $13 per acre. Amos Kendall to Corcoran, May 18, 1841, January 16, 1844, January 16, 1848, and Corcoran to Kendall, January 31, 1848, November 17, 1852, and January 1, 1853, Corcoran MSS.; also numerous conveyances in the Sangamon and Logan County Deed Records between Corcoran and Kendall and others.

[45] Corcoran to Captain J. B. Russell of Chicago, Illinois, November 16, 1857, Letter Book, Corcoran MSS.

[46] Letter Book No. 26, p. 61, Corcoran MSS. These figures include some lands which were acquired subsequent to 1847 but they may not be greater than the value of those of the original purchase which had been sold.

Corcoran's other land speculations, though smaller, looked at the outset exceedingly promising. He had the largest share in the promotion of the city of Superior, Wisconsin, which was projected as the Eastern terminus of the Northern transcontinental railroad and he financed the shares of such Southerners as Senator Hunter of Virginia, John C. Breckinridge of Kentucky, and Walker, formerly of Mississippi, then of Washington, as well as those of Douglas, Bright, Forney, and W. A. Richardson.[47] Two South Carolina congressmen, William W. Boyce and William Aiken, also had small investments in Superior.[48] This city was subsequently displaced by Duluth as the chief port on the lake, not so much because of the better natural advantages of the latter as because Jay Cooke had supplanted Corcoran after 1860 as the favorite banker of the national administration, and Cooke was a promoter of Duluth. Corcoran also made purchases of land in Illinois with Representative Orlando B. Ficklin, in Indiana with Bright, in Kansas with Major George Deas, and in Arkansas with Bright and Dr. C. B. Mitchell.[49]

Corcoran's Washington partner, George W. Riggs,[50] also made investments in Western lands. In 1858 he entered in St. Croix and Dunn counties, Wisconsin, 9,240 acres. Previously he had aided other members of his family in speculations in Illinois.

Another Southern banker whose land investments are worthy of notice is Joseph B. Loose of Hagerstown, Maryland. In 1834 Loose went to Michigan where he invested his capital and that of his family in public lands, acquiring thereby over 4,000 acres. He then went on to Springfield, Illinois, where he took up his residence, established a bank and with its funds invested largely in Illinois lands and Springfield and Chicago real estate. Loose was fortunate enough to make excellent

[47] Corcoran to Robert J. Walker, November 21, 1854; A. Hyde to S. Bright, May 11, 1858, Letter Book, Corcoran MSS. Forney tells how he was drawn into this venture by Stephen A. Douglas in his *Anecdotes of Public Men,* 2 vols. (New York, 1873), I, 19-20.

[48] "Statement of Taxes for 1855 on Property Superior paid by Wm. H. Newton," Letter Book No. 9, Corcoran MSS. Aiken visited Kansas and Nebraska in 1857, apparently on a land investment tour and was reported to be "highly pleased" with Nebraska. Omaha *Nebraskian,* June 17, 1857.

[49] The Corcoran MSS. contain many letters concerning these transactions.

[50] Katharine E. Crane, "George Washington Riggs," in *Dictionary of American Biography,* XV, 603-604.

selections of prairie land from which he could shortly derive a substantial income in the form of rents or could sell at rapidly increasing prices. In 1856 he made another venture in Iowa land, buying 7,380 acres. He returned to Hagerstown to spend his last years, having accumulated a comfortable fortune in the course of his various speculations. In 1879 he was reported to own lots in Springfield and Chicago, farming land in Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska, in addition to extensive property in Virginia and Maryland.[51]

Another very fortunate series of investments was made by the family of Matthew T. Scott who was president of the Northern Bank of Kentucky at Lexington. He and his two sons Matthew T. and Isaac W., together with Samuel P. Humphrey of Woodford County, Courtney Pickett of Fayette County, Richard and Joel Higgins, John McFarland, and others of Kentucky, made a series of large investments in Illinois and Iowa. Isaac Scott began these investments at Springfield, Illinois, where he entered 2,340 acres in 1836. His brother entered 18,300 acres at the Danville office in 1854 and in the following year 3,450 acres in western Iowa. The Scotts did not entrust the management of this large estate to local agents but sent Matthew T., Jr., to Illinois to develop the property. He undertook large improvements upon the lands in McLean and Livingston counties, laid out the town of Chenoa, broke up great tracts of land which he cultivated by hired labor and tenants, and soon developed one of the most important real estate and farming businesses in the prairie section. Scott developed a peculiar type of farm lease under which the tenant was encouraged to make improvements which were credited toward the purchase of the land. Many improvements were made but few tenants at the time seemed to be able to complete their contracts and acquire the coveted title. Meantime, the land was rapidly rising in value and the Scotts and their associates became possessed of a valuable estate.[52]

[51] *Biographical Cyclopedia of Representative Men of Maryland and District of Columbia* (Baltimore, 1879), 479.

[52] *History of McLean County, Illinois* (Chicago, 1879), 499 ff.; *Atlas of McLean Co. and the State of Illinois* (Chicago, 1874). The deed records of McLean County for the fifties and sixties contain numerous conveyances, mortgages, and leases of Matthew T. Scott, Jr., and the other associates.

A number of Southern railroad promoters found capital to invest in Northern lands. Abram Blanding[53] of Richland District, South Carolina, who was closely identified with the movement for internal improvements and the beginnings of the Louisiana, Cincinnati, and Charleston Railroad, united with James K. Douglas of the same district in the purchase of 4,500 acres in southern Indiana in 1836. Charles Edmonston,[54] a director of the same railroad and a member of the South Carolina House, was one of six Charleston residents who, in 1835 and 1836, made entries of one to three thousand acres in the Green Bay area of Wisconsin. There was also Thomas Swann,[55] a native of Virginia who moved to Baltimore and there became president of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. He united with John H. Brent and Alexander Hunter in the purchase of 2,600 acres in southeastern Iowa in 1839.

Southern politicians as well as commercial, banking, and railroad men were attracted by land speculation in the Northwest. Indeed, the speculative craze of 1835 and 1836 had gone to such extremes and had caused so many persons in influential financial and political positions to make wild ventures that great alarm was felt. Jackson's specie circular of July 11, 1836, had been anticipated by a resolution of the House of June 21, providing for an investigation of the amount of borrowing by members of Congress and other government officials from deposit banks for speculation in public lands.[56] The select committee, after a superficial investigation, reported that it had been unable to secure informa-

[53] J. Franklin Jameson (ed.), *The Correspondence of John C. Calhoun,* American Historical Association, *Annual Report,* 1899, II, 365, 419, 431; Ulrich B. Phillips, *History of Transportation in the Eastern Cotton Belt to 1860* (New York, 1908), *passim;* Theodore D. Jervey, *Robert Y. Hayne and His Times* (New York, 1909), 419 ff.

[54] Jervey, *Robert Y. Hayne,* 419.

[55] Swann was also president of the First National Bank of Baltimore, mayor of the city, United States senator and representative. For his participation in the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, see William P. Smith, *The Book of the Great Railway Celebrations of 1857* (New York, 1858), 45, 71, *passim.*

[56] *Congressional Globe,* 24 Cong. 1 Sess., 456 (June 21, 1836). The Washington *United States Telegraph,* quoted in the Indianapolis *Indiana Journal,* July 23, 1836, fulminated against politician-speculators, especially Amos Kendall and Benjamin F. Butler, who were accused of using public funds for their land activities. Kendall made an investment in Illinois lands which is described elsewhere in this article; Butler had an interest in the American Land Company which had large investments in the Northwest.

tion from the banks concerning their loans for land investments.[57] The committee had called before it Preston S. Loughborough who, though obviously possessed of information about land companies, refused to divulge anything of interest and apparently for good reason.[58] A resident of Franklin County, Kentucky, and in 1836 chief clerk of the post office department in Washington, Loughborough himself was speculating in Illinois lands of which he bought 9,925 acres.

Loughborough may have had information about the land deals in which Senator Arnold Naudain of Delaware was engaged. With Edward Tatnall and Merritt Canby, likewise of Delaware, Naudain entered 11,365 acres in Indiana in 1836 and 1837. The following year the group entered 12,000 acres in Illinois and 2,840 acres in Iowa. Naudain resigned his seat in the Senate on June 16, 1836,[59] whether as a result of the growing opposition to members of Congress speculating in land or whether it was owing to his desire to devote his full time to the business is not clear. In 1837 he was so enamored of the West that he considered making his home in Illinois.[60] By 1849, however, he had failed to advance his fortune through land speculation and he then sought a Federal position from his old friend, Thomas Ewing, secretary of the interior.[61]

A more tragic case is that of Thomas Ludwell Lee Brent, a Virginia planter who served for a time in the diplomatic service. Like some other gentlemen farmers of the South and East, Brent had a grand dream of establishing a vast estate in the West, operated by tenants, on which he might reside in baronial splendor. In 1836 he went to Michigan where he bought 21,687 acres of public lands. Unfortunately, he exhausted his funds in purchasing land and had nothing to expend on

[57] *Cong. Globe,* 24 Cong., 1 Sess., 482 (July 2, 1836); *Niles' Register* (Baltimore, Philadelphia, 1811-1849), L (1836), 403 ff.

[58] *House Reports,* 24 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 846, pp. 1-6.

[59] *Cong. Globe,* 24 Cong., 1 Sess., 451 (June 17, 1836); Indianapolis *Indiana Democrat,* June 29, 1836.

[60] Dubuque *Iowa News,* July 15, 1837.

[61] A. Naudain to T. Ewing, Philadelphia, May 11, 1849, Ewing MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

the development of his estate. He was land poor and upon his death a large part of his holdings passed out of the family's possession.[62]

The Western land speculations of Charles W. Short[63] are interesting. He established himself at Transylvania University, Lexington, Kentucky, and later at the University of Louisville, as a national authority on medicine and botany. Perhaps it was a field trip which took him to Illinois in 1836 where at the Springfield office he entered 720 acres of land. In 1845 appeared his *Observations on the Botany of Illinois.* That his interest in Illinois was sustained is evident from the fact that he entered 4,960 acres at the Danville office in 1853. A relative, William Short, also of Louisville, entered 2,260 acres in the same district in 1853 and 1854.

In the light of the approaching "irrepressible conflict," the land investments made by some Southern politicians in the fifties are surprising. William B. Stokes, who represented a central Tennessee constituency in Congress from 1859 to 1861 and 1865 to 1871, entered 7,000 acres in the pineries of Kanabec and Isanti counties, Minnesota, in 1856 and 1857. Stokes was a staunch unionist, and in the critical days of 1860 and 1861 when the Southern states were being urged to secede, he fought valiantly to preserve the Union and to keep his state a part of it.[64] The secession of Tennessee did not change his attitude; his state was wrong and the Union must be preserved at all hazards. During the war he was in command of a Union regiment and in the postwar period was a radical Republican.[65]

A Kentuckian whose economic interests and national sympathies coincided was Jeremiah T. Boyle of Danville. According to a local his-

[62] Judge Albert Miller estimated Brent's fortune at $90,000 to $100,000. He also says that Brent bought 70,000 acres of land in Michigan. If the latter statement is correct, the larger part of the land was probably entered at the government sale by others than Brent. Miller's account of "Thomas L. L. Brent," in the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society, *Collections* (Lansing, 1877-1929), IX (1886), 192-96, is interesting.

[63] Johnston, *Memorial History of Louisville,* II, 455-56; Filson Club *Publications* (Louisville, 1884-), XX (1905), 80; George H. Genzmer, "Charles Wilkins Short," *Dictionary of American Biography,* XVII, 127-28.

[64] *Cong. Globe,* 36 Cong., 1 Sess., 365-68 (January 7, 1860).

[65] Oliver P. Temple, *East Tennessee and the Civil War* (Cincinnati, 1899), 203, 219.

torian, Boyle was a slaveholder who was averse to slavery and favored gradual emancipation. He built up a large law practice and became interested in various railroad schemes and land speculations. Among the latter was the Iowa Land Company which was organized to promote the towns of Clinton, Elvira, and Dewitt, and otherwise to speculate in Iowa and Illinois lands. It is not clear what part Boyle played in its affairs but he is listed with L. M. Flournoy of Paducah, Kentucky, and others as "promoters" of the company. Boyle was a unionist in 1860 and took up arms in support of the North.[66]

On the other side was John C. Breckinridge, Kentucky politician who, while vice-president of the United States, entered with Francis K. Hunt 2,813 acres in Winnebago County, Iowa. Breckinridge had once resided in Iowa where he had learned something of the state and its resources and he was attempting to capitalize upon that experience. It has also been seen that he had a share in the promotion of Superior, Wisconsin. Hunt has been described as "one of the first lawyers in Kentucky."[67] When secession came, Breckinridge wavered for a time but eventually went with the South; his associate remained a unionist.

One of the most uncompromising members of the Southern Rights wing of the Democratic party was Eli S. Shorter of Eufaula, Alabama, who was a planter, lawyer, politician, and railroad official. He advocated disunion in 1850 and again in 1858 if Kansas were not admitted under the Lecompton constitution, and declared that should Alabama withdraw from the Union "her sons will be prepared to defend it in the forum or in the field."[68] Despite his uncompromising attitude upon the territorial question and his open support of disunion, Shorter did not hesitate to invest in Northern lands. In 1855, 1856, and 1857, and again in 1859 he toured Iowa and Nebraska, buying 3,320 acres in the former

[66] *First Annual Report of the Transactions of the Iowa Land Company. June 2, 1856* (Chicago, 1856); Johnston, *Memorial History of Louisville,* I, 388-90.

[67] Ranck, *History of Lexington,* 54; *War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies* (Washington, 1880-1901), Ser. I, Vol. XVI, Pt. I, 457.

[68] *Cong. Globe,* 35 Cong., 1 Sess., 770 (February 18, 1858). See, also, *ibid.,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 399 (April 9, 1856).

and 9,625 acres in the latter state. Two years later he was a colonel in the Confederate infantry.[69]

Eufaula furnished two other persons who invested in Western lands. Between 1849 and 1859 Selden S. Walkley entered 8,280 acres in Iowa.[70] Jefferson Buford, aroused by the activities of the New England Emigrant Aid Company to "save Kansas for freedom," issued in 1855 a stirring appeal for personal aid and financial support for an expedition to colonize Kansas with slavery defenders.[71] Shortly afterwards he proceeded to Kansas with a band of supporters, dubbed by their Northern opponents "Border Ruffians," and took an active part in the Kansas conflict. In common with most pro- and antislavery leaders in the territory, Buford seemed as much interested in his land activities as in the slavery question. With Rush Elmore, a former Alabaman who had become a territorial judge of Kansas and who was himself something of a speculator, Buford organized and laid out the town of Virginia.[72] He also bought 1,760 acres of Delaware Trust lands for $4,672 and 160 acres at the Iowa Point sale for $448. In addition, he purchased a squatter's claim on the Delaware Trust lands for which he paid $1,000. This he stood to lose because of a technicality and he besought the government to protect his right to the claim.[73]

Another Alabama politician who made investments in Northern

[69] Omaha *Nebraskian,* September 16, 1857; W. Brewer, *Alabama: Her History, Resources, War Record and Public Men* (Montgomery, 1872), 126-27; William Garrett, *Reminiscences of Public Men in Alabama for Thirty Years* (Atlanta, 1872), 617.

[70] Mention might be made of Horace Everett of Sumter County, Alabama, who in 1855 entered 35,000 acres in western Iowa. At that time Everett's residence was given as above but a year later, when he was engaged in entering 20,000 acres in the Plattsburg, Missouri, district, it was given as Iowa. Everett formed a partnership with Abiel Leonard and opened an office in Council Bluffs. See advertisement in Council Bluffs *Bugle,* September 4, 1855. In 1863 Everett was collector of internal revenue in Iowa. *Official Records,* Ser. III, Vol. III, 84.

[71] The story of Buford's expedition is told in Walter L. Fleming, "The Buford Expedition to Kansas," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), VI (1900), 38-48, and Elmer LeRoy Craik, "Southern Interest in Territorial Kansas, 1854-1858," in Kansas State Historical Society, *Collections* (Topeka, 1881-1928), XV (1923), 334-488, especially 397.

[72] Act of February 19, 1857, incorporating Virginia Town Association, Kansas Territory, *Session Laws* (1857), 313.

[73] Jefferson Buford to Hon. B. Fitzpatrick, Westport, Missouri, accompanying letter of Fitzpatrick to Jacob Thompson, secretary of the interior, April 16, 1857, Indian Office.

lands was Williamson R. W. Cobb of Jackson. Cobb was a Democratic member of the national House of Representatives from 1847 to 1861. Like Buford, he was present at the Delaware Trust sale at Leavenworth where he bought fifteen city lots. His later investments are very devious and difficult to follow but it seems that he arranged with John F. Kinney to enter jointly 7,680 acres in Nebraska. Cobb was a director and stockholder in the Nebraska Real Estate and Exchange Company[74] and entered personally 1,120 acres in the eastern part of Nebraska. When the Civil War came, his lands were deeded to his son-in-law to avoid confiscation.[75]

No less prominent than Breckinridge, Buford, Shorter, and Cobb among the Southern politicians who invested in Northern lands was John Slidell, Democratic representative and later senator from Louisiana. Elected to Congress in 1842, Slidell became a power in the Democratic party, partly through his own shrewdness and wit and partly through the fact that he was related by marriage to August Belmont, the New York banker. Belmont was devoted to the welfare of the Democratic party as were also Corcoran and a business associate, Elisha Riggs. With all three of these bankers Slidell was friendly and with two of them he undertook land ventures in the North. Slidell and Riggs entered 9,000 acres in northeastern Wisconsin in 1857,[76] and the following year they entered 16,000 acres in western Iowa. Slidell and Belmont jointly entered 20,000 acres in western Iowa in November, 1858. Belmont and Slidell broke off relations in 1859, apparently because the former had lost confidence in Buchanan and had transferred his support to Douglas. "Essentially a moderate" in 1860, says Professor Sears of Slidell, he "found himself supporting the most extreme wing," and when Louisiana seceded Slidell went with his state.[77] After

[74] Nebraska City *Nebraska News,* October 10, 24, 1857.

[75] Omaha *Nebraska Advertiser,* September 27, October 4, 1862.

[76] A. Hyde to L. Riggs, Baltimore, June 27, 1870, Corcoran MSS., mentions 30,000 acres in Wisconsin which were purchased by Slidell and Riggs. If the figure is correct it is probable that much of the land was entered by agents, perhaps in their own name and assigned to Slidell and Riggs. This would make a total of 66,000 acres in which Slidell had an interest in Iowa and Wisconsin.

[77] Louis M. Sears, *John Slidell* (Durham, 1925), 159-60. Belmont's pique at not gaining the post of Minister at Madrid may also have alienated him from Buchanan. Draft,

the attack upon Fort Sumter, he became alarmed for his investments in the North and urged his friend Corcoran to arrange a sale. On May 14, 1861, Corcoran negotiated a sale to a Mr. Fay, the payment to be made in New Orleans city bonds.[78]

A Southern politician who engaged in a variety of speculations was Robert J. Walker. Financial agent of the Illinois Central Railroad,[79] promoter of the city of Superior and of the St. Croix and Lake Superior Railroad and the Texas and Pacific Railroad,[80] shareholder in the Chicago Land Company, and land speculator in Wisconsin, Mississippi, and Louisiana, Walker was as active in business as in politics. The year 1856 found him enjoying financial success almost beyond his dreams as witnessed by the following quotation from a letter of April 28 to James Buchanan:[81]

I have sold most of my Mississippi & Louisiana lands without warranty for very large cash prices & am selling the remainder from time to time. Besides my Wisconsin property has increased nearly a hundred fold in value & where I bought as farms, by the *acre,* are now flourishing cities. To crown all, my quicksilver property in Cali. has turned out of enormous value.

A land speculation different from those mentioned above was promoted by Dr. Alexander Graham of Lexington, Virginia. He formed a syndicate which purchased the much sought after military reservation at Fort Snelling, Minnesota. Like the lands of defaulting officers and their bondsmen which were sold to Corcoran for a song, numerous Indian[82] and military reservations were disposed of to faithful supporters of the parties in power during the years 1850 to 1870 at what might be called

letter of James Buchanan to John Slidell, Washington, June 24, 1859; Slidell to Buchanan, July 3, 1859, Buchanan MSS. (Historical Society of Pennsylvania Library).

[78] Hyde to Slidell, Washington, May 14, 1861, Corcoran Letter Book, Corcoran MSS.

[79] Gates, *Illinois Central Railroad,* 69-71.

[80] Corcoran to Walker, August 25, 1856, and Hyde to *id.,* November 24, 1856, Corcoran Letter Book, Corcoran MSS. Walker was operating at least in part on borrowed capital, his debt to Corcoran being $11,426 on January 15, 1855. This debt remained unpaid as late as 1867. Corcoran to Walker, January 15, 1855, and memo of May 24, 1867, *ibid.*

[81] Letter in Historical Society of Pennsylvania Library.

[82] For the story of a small but valuable Indian reservation in Kansas, see Paul Wallace Gates, "A Fragment of Kansas Land History: The Disposal of the Christian Indian Tract," in *Kansas Historical Quarterly* (Topeka, 1931-), VI (1937), 227, *passim.*

bargain prices, and the sale of Fort Snelling is more or less typical of the others. Graham, while visiting his friend, John B. Floyd, secretary of war, learned that the Fort Snelling reservation was for sale. Here was the opportunity of a lifetime and Graham did not neglect it. He informed Franklin Steele, a prominent Minnesota speculator who decided to have a share in the purchase of the tract. To secure capital, Graham and Steele approached two influential New Yorkers, Richard Schell,[83] a broker and "speculator" who was a heavy contributor to Democratic campaign funds, and John Mather, a member of the New York legislature. These four men formed a syndicate and purchased the 8,000 acres for $90,000, a price well below the estimated value of the land and one which did not reflect the competitive demand for the tract.[84] Henry M. Rice, Democratic "boss" of Minnesota, was interested in the sale and it was noted that Douglas ostentatiously denied that he had had any share in the transaction.[85]

After 1854 Illinois lands, previously so popular with Southerners, were in private hands and it was Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska which attracted the most attention. To show the wide distribution of such investments in the South the following table of land sales is included:[86]

Name	*Residence*	*Land District*	*Year*	*Acres*
Boulden, Jesse H.	Bourbon County, Ala.	Ft. Dodge	1857	1148
Burson, Zachariah L.	Washington County, Tenn.	Des Moines	1855	760
Burson, Zachariah L.	Washington County, Tenn.	Sioux City	1857	1144
Clark, Thomas A.	Orleans Parish, La.	Osage	1856	4382
Curry, George W.	Monroe County, Va.	Council Bluffs	1857	760
Curry, George W.	Monroe County, Va.	Sioux City	1857	720
Drexel, Frederick	Taylor County, Va.	Council Bluffs	1855	1120
Fain, Samuel N.	Jefferson County, Tenn.	Fairfield	1855-56	9916
Ford, John R.	Danville, Ky.	Ft. Dodge, Des Moines	1855	3400
Gregg, John	Loudon County, Va.	Ft. Dodge	1857	1050
Hager, William H.	Washington County, Md.	Iowa City	1854	5680
Hough, John A.	Maury County, Tenn.	Brownsville, Nebraska	1860	1330

[83] "The Covode Investigation," *House Reports,* 36 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 648, pp. 511-12.

[84] "Fort Snelling Investigation," *ibid.,* 35 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 351, *passim.*

[85] Letter of Stephen A. Douglas, August 29, 1857, published in Chicago *Times* and copied in the Washington *National Intelligencer,* September 4, 1857. Douglas' denial of interest in the Fort Snelling sale may have been correct but the letter is a shifty effort to skirt the truth as closely as possible.

[86] Compiled from abstracts in the general land office, department of the interior. Unless otherwise indicated the districts are in Iowa.

Irwin, G. and T.	Baltimore, Md.	Ft. Dodge	1860	4564
Lash, Israel G., Jr.	Forsyth County, N. C.	Des Moines	1860	4564
Lowd, William W.	Orleans Parish, La.	Council Bluffs	1856	1690
Lungren, Samuel S.	Washington County, Md.	Des Moines	1855	2680
McCown, Andrew R.	Hancock County, Va.	Council Bluffs	1857	1460
Maxwell, Thomas	Tuscaloosa, Ala.	Ft. Dodge	1857	1440
Merrill, Harvey G.	Orleans Parish, La.	Council Bluffs	1856	8120
Orr, Charles C.	Orleans Parish, La.	Sioux City	1858-60	4214
Orr, Charles C.	Orleans Parish, La.	Dakota City, Neb.	1859	920
Peters, Stephen F.	Campbell County, Va.	Council Bluffs	1855	6600
Pratt, William H.	Mobile, Ala.	Council Bluffs	1855	4890
Rawson, William A	Stewart County, Ga.	Sioux City	1857	2744
Walton, Simon H.	Mason County, Ky.	Des Moines	1854	3320
Watkins, Isaac R.	Charlotte, Va.	Council Bluffs	1858	8528
Watkins, Isaac R.	Charlotte, Va.	Ft. Dodge	1858	1137
Wilkinson, James W.	Charleston, S. C.	Ft. Dodge	1857	3518
Wolfinger, Michael	Washington County, Md.	Des Moines	1855	2000
Wormald, James	Mason County, Ky.	Chariton	1855	2880
Lushbaugh, Benjamin F.	Washington County, Md.	Osage	1857	4100

The panic of 1857 and the sharp fall of agricultural prices caused a scarcity of money in the West, and squatters, faced with auction sales of their claims if they did not pre-empt them, were forced to seek outside assistance at exorbitant interest rates. The squatters and newspapers friendly to them clamored for the postponement of the land sales.[87] Unfortunately, the depression produced a government deficit and the Buchanan administration could scarcely afford to relinquish the anticipated revenue from the sale of lands. Perhaps also the Democratic leaders recognized that the cheap land sections of the West, especially Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, were lost to their party and that they could therefore disregard the piteous appeals for

[87] Strongly divergent views were invariably expressed by Westerners when the government was preparing to bring public lands into market. Generally opposed to sales were the squatters, frontier newspapers, and local politicians who deplored the advantages which the sales would give to the "loan sharks"; favorable were the more ardent of the "booster" element (except in a depression as the years following 1857), the local capitalists and land speculators as well as those influential Easterners who were seeking opportunities for lucrative investments. The government was betwixt the devil and the deep blue sea, since it needed the revenue from the sales but feared the resentment of the squatters. When the opposition became too strong, sales were sometimes postponed. After 1854 there was an added incentive to have the lands brought on the market as under the Graduation Act their price automatically declined after they had been subject to sale ten years. A careful study is needed of the question of holding or postponing land sales as it was of vital importance to the squatters and others interested. Jacob Thompson, secretary of the interior, gives some attention to the problem in his *Annual Report* for 1860, p. 4.

postponement. There was ordered to be sold in the depression years an area equivalent to Missouri and most of this land was located in states or territories already controlled by the Republicans. The "loan sharks" again put in their appearance at these sales and it is probable that some of the Southerners who entered large tracts in the years 1858-1860 were employing their funds in this way. Perhaps they may have been influential in preventing postponement of the sales in order that they might be able to lend their funds to needy squatters.

This was the period when Shorter, Slidell, Belmont, Taylor, and Walker made most of their purchases. Other Southerners of note also made investments in the last years before secession. James Calloway of Wilkes County, North Carolina, entered some 6,880 acres at the bitterly opposed sale at Lecompton, Kansas, in 1859 and 1860. In the spring and summer of 1858, four Virginians, William Hurley of Henrico County, Michael Hurley of Norfolk County, Jerman W. Pace of Pittsylvania County, and Edwin G. Halsey of Campbell County, entered in western Iowa 11,500, 5,760, 2,500, and 1,760 acres respectively. One other most illusive person, Solomon Tifft of Jackson, Mississippi, listed in the Mississippi census of 1852 as an attorney having property valued at $500,[88] entered between October, 1859, and September, 1860, a total of 27,480 acres in eastern Nebraska. So much Southern capital was invested in Kansas in the short period from 1854 to 1861 that Senator James H. Lane was moved to lament in 1862, "We have in Kansas a larger proportion of rebel property than any other state in this Union."[89]

It thus appears that many Southern planters, bankers, shippers, lawyers, politicians, and others invested in lands in the Northwestern states in the ante-bellum years. Every slave state east of the Mississippi was represented as was also Texas. So popular did Northern land investments become in the South that land agents in Minnesota and elsewhere advertised in Southern papers, "Land investments made for Southern and Eastern capitalists that will net forty and sixty per cent per an-

[88] Census data furnished by Miss Mary E. Cameron.

[89] *Cong. Globe,* 37 Cong., 2 Sess., 3379 (July 16, 1862).

num."[90] The author's tabulation, by no means complete, of the Southern purchases of government land of 1,000 acres or more in the Northwestern states shows a total in excess of 1,500,000 acres.[91]

There is also evidence that other Southerners were purchasing lands in the North, not from the Federal government but from other sources. For example, Dr. Stephen Duncan of Natchez, "a 4,000 bale planter and the owner of 500 negroes," was accused, with other large planters, of investing "great amounts" in land and securities in the North or "elsewhere out of the South."[92] Joshua B. Leavens of Mobile, Alabama, claimed ownership of 28,000 acres in the Military Tract of Illinois in 1838.[93] The famous Kentucky divine, Robert J. Breckinridge of Danville, owned in Iowa in 1857 a full section of 640 acres assessed at $3,840 and in 1858 he bought in Illinois in partnership with a nephew 320 acres for $4,000.[94] A very substantial purchase, the facts of which were found in the deed records of Champaign County, Illinois, was

[90] Advertisement of Tracy and Farnham, in Washington *National Intelligencer,* September 19, 1854.

[91] The entry books of all the states of the Old Northwest, Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska were examined. An effort was made to take account of all land entries of more than one thousand acres but where the entries of individuals were widely scattered it was difficult to compile them. Examples are the entries of Miles and Elias White. They are scattered over many dozen huge folio volumes and are not massed together as are those of Cabell, Slidell, and Belmont. The first examination missed the White entries and only after the name was encountered in practically every Iowa abstract volume for the years 1850 to 1860 was it found desirable to go over the ground again and collect their entries. It is certain that other Southerners whose entries were encountered less frequently but were equally scattered would be missed in such a study. The very volume of the material precluded a more complete analysis. Another cause of understatement of the amount of Southern entries in the Northwest is the fact that the names of persons who located lands with military warrants as found in the warrant abstracts are not accompanied by the addresses of the locators. If there was excess payment upon the tract occasioned by its acreage being larger than the amount of the warrant, the warrantee's or the assignee's name would appear in the cash abstract which always gives the address. In as much as a large part of the speculative entries after 1847 were made with warrants, it will be appreciated how much this factor may have minimized the figure of Southern entries.

[92] Percy L. Rainwater, *Mississippi: Storm Center of Secession, 1856-1861* (Baton Rouge, 1938), 140-41; Dunbar Rowland, *Encyclopedia of Mississippi History,* 2 vols. (Madison, Wis., 1907), I, 666.

[93] Advertisement in Quincy (Illinois) *Argus,* December 1, 1838, mentioning 28,000 acres of military bounty lands owned by Joseph B. Leavens of Mobile, Alabama, and cautioning people against buying them because of estate difficulties.

[94] Oliver Cock to Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, Burlington, Iowa, December 17, 1857; S. M. Breckinridge to *id.,* St. Louis, April 5, 1858, Breckinridge MSS.

made by a group of wealthy residents of Shelby County, Kentucky. William M. King, the Harbisons—William, William Scott, John, Baxter D., and George L.— Francis J. Peters, and others bought 12,755 acres in Champaign and Piatt counties, Illinois, for a total of $76,535. Baxter Harbison moved to Champaign County where he managed the sale of a part of this large holding for the others who remained in their native state.[95] A careful examination of the deed records of other counties in the Northwestern states would doubtless show the investment of additional Southern capital.

City property in the Northwestern states also attracted a substantial amount of Southern capital. Outstanding among such investments are those of John C. Breckinridge, Hunter, Corcoran, Boyce, and Aiken in Superior; Breckinridge in Prairie Du Chien and Burlington;[96] Buford, Fant, and Corcoran in Leavenworth; Smithson and Easley in Elwood and White Cloud, Kansas; Walker, Smithson, and Loose in Chicago; J. B. Danforth and Charles H. Lewis of Jefferson County, Kentucky, in Springfield; Breckinridge and Graham in St. Paul; Easley in Council Bluffs; and Francis L. and Robert W. Smith[97] of Alexandria, Virginia, in Sioux City. Mention might also be made of the Baltimore Western Land Company which advertised city lots in Bloomington, Iowa, in 1843, and of the part played by William Stokes of Louisville and H. W. Varnton of Georgetown, in the promotion of Mound City, Illinois, in 1860.[98]

The rekindling of the old fires of sectional hatred did not end but, instead, seemed to accelerate the flow of Southern capital into the North. After the adoption of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, 800,000 acres of land in the states of the Upper Mississippi Valley were bought by Southerners.

[95] In the deed records of Champaign County there are numerous conveyances between the various members of this group which show the division of the land and its subsequent resale. Baxter Harbison who with George received 3,320 acres, sold land to the amount of $134,492 between 1858 and 1902.

[96] The Breckinridge MSS. contain frequent allusions to investments in Superior, Prairie Du Chien, Burlington, St. Paul, and elsewhere.

[97] Francis L. Smith to George W. Jones, Alexandria, Virginia, May 2, 1866, Jones MSS. (Library of the Historical, Memorial and Art Department of Iowa, Des Moines).

[98] *Report of Jesse E. Peyton, Esq., to the Eastern Stockholders of the Emporium Real Estate and Manufacturing Company of Mound City* (Philadelphia, 1860).

Even the financial crash of 1857 did not end the capital migration for 170,000 acres were bought between 1858 and 1860 and some land was purchased by Southerners just as the secession movement got under way. The quantity and comparative lateness of these purchases lends weight to the accusation brought against Dr. Duncan that he and other conservative unionists were investing their funds in the North where they would be remote from any possible danger zone.

Some of the land purchased by Southerners was sold advantageously within a few months but a much larger amount had to be carried for years, sometimes for a generation, before a satisfactory price could be secured. Meantime, interest, agents' fees, and the rapidly rising tax burden increased the original investment. It is impossible to estimate with any degree of accuracy the amount of Southern capital which was invested in Northern farming lands and city lots in the ante-bellum years but one may give a minimum figure about which there should be little quibbling. An examination of the deed records of such prairie counties as Benton and White, Indiana, and Vermillion, McLean, Logan, Sangamon, and Christian, Illinois, reveals that large amounts of land owned by absentee speculators were being sold in the fifties for prices ranging from $5 to $15.50 per acre. Values of undeveloped land in Wisconsin, Iowa, and Nebraska would certainly be lower but improved land before the panic would doubtless be considered worth $5 per acre. Most of the lands of the Whites, Easley and Willingham, and some other Southerners were entered for squatters and therefore would have a higher valuation than raw land possessing no improvements. A conservative estimate of the value of the property owned by Southerners in the Upper Mississippi Valley would be between $4,000,000 and $8,000,000. The probability is that the total amount would be greater, considering the city lot business and the smaller holdings which do not appear in the present estimates.

Absentee ownership of land, though found everywhere in the West, was not regarded favorably by the local residents and these Southern investments were destined to produce ill will and friction. The outbreak of the Civil War gave Westerners an opportunity to fulminate against

the Southern speculators and to demand the confiscation of their lands. It irked many, as Mrs. Jane Gray Swisshelm reveals,[99] that Breckinridge and Slidell could participate in the rebellion without the government taking action to confiscate their Wisconsin and Minnesota property. An examination of the Congressional debates upon the confiscation bills in 1861 and 1862 shows that the investments of these two men were more generally known than those of any other Confederate or Southern speculator and that several members of Congress were seeking to frame a bill which would enable the government to confiscate their possessions. Senator Lyman Trumbull was especially anxious to have the holdings of Slidell confiscated and again and again he referred to them. On April 7, 1862, he said that he was "unwilling that rebel chiefs like Slidell and Mason who are said to be large landholders in the loyal States . . . should be permitted to enjoy the fruits of their estates situated within our jurisdiction."[100] Again on April 24 he expressed his fear that the bill under consideration would not strike at Slidell's property.[101] On May 6 he quoted from a constituent who mentioned additional Northern lands owned by Slidell:[102]

> Five or six years ago, when attending the land sales at Danville in this State, I met an agent of John Slidell . . . who entered for him some forty thousand acres of land, and I learned that the next year he entered some thirty thousand acres in Iowa. Last week, when in St. Louis, I met this agent and he informed me that Slidell still owned these lands.

Trumbull added, "there are a great many such instances all over the State of Illinois and all over the western States where these rebels hold real estate, for they have been making investments for years in our

[99] Mrs. Swisshelm considered the Confiscation Act of 1862 deplorably weak, resenting especially the fact that confiscated property of persons participating in the rebellion might be recovered by their heirs. She writes feelingly of such Confederate leaders as Breckinridge who "holds" property in her adopted state of Minnesota and John Slidell whose "twenty-five thousand acres of Minnesota land is to be secured to him and heirs." Arthur J. Larson, ed., *Crusader and Feminist: Letters of Jane Gray Swisshelm, 1858-1865* (St. Paul, 1934), 134 *et passim.* She apparently confused their Wisconsin property mentioned above.

[100] *Cong. Globe,* 37 Cong., 2 Sess., 1560 (April 7, 1862).

[101] *Ibid.,* 1813 (April 24, 1862).

[102] *Ibid.,* 1959 (May 6, 1862).

lands. Are we not to touch them?" Finally, on June 27 he complained that the Senate bill would not permit the government to touch the $100,000 worth of property which Slidell owned in Illinois.[103]

Similarly, Representative William Windom of Minnesota inveighed against "Breckinridge, Toombs, Slidell, and many others of the same class in the South, [who] own large tracts of land in my own State." He asked:[104]

> Do you think the people there will contentedly bear the burdens we impose on them when they see this property untouched by the government? When I return to my constituents, and they ask me why these lands were not confiscated, will they be quite satisfied with the answer, "I was afraid it would irritate and offend Messrs Breckinridge, Toombs & Co., and therefore I rolled the whole burden on you.

Senator James R. Doolittle was also anxious to find a means of confiscating the "large amount of real estate" which Slidell owned "both in Illinois and in Wisconsin, as well as in Louisiana."[105] Representative Thomas D. Eliot of Massachusetts approved a bill to confiscate the "large estates owned by enemies in Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa and Missouri, the proceeds of which are made to support the leading rebels in the armies and government of the South."[106]

Professor Randall has shown how ineffectively the North enforced the confiscation laws during the Civil War.[107] He estimates that the total returns from the sale of confiscated property under the acts of 1861 and 1862 were approximately $300,000, none of which was from the states of Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, or Illinois. Confiscation proceedings could be avoided by transferring property to loyal citizens and by this means Slidell saved his investments in the North. Despite the bitter resentment against him, John C. Breckinridge did not suffer confiscation of his extensive investments, perhaps because they were held jointly with others whose loyalty was not in question. Some of his lands were sold

[103] *Ibid.*, 2972 (June 27, 1862).
[104] *Ibid.*, 2244 (May 20, 1862).
[105] *Ibid.*, Pt. IV, Appendix, 140.
[106] *Ibid.*, 37 Cong., 2 Sess., 2357 (May 26, 1862).
[107] James G. Randall, *Constitutional Problems Under Lincoln* (New York, 1926), 289-91.

for taxes, however.[108] Stokes, being a unionist, was in no danger of losing his lands and Walker, for the same reason, had nothing to fear for his Northern possessions. He may, however, have suffered the loss of his Southern property.

Easley and Willingham were Union supporters in 1860 and 1861 and opposed the action of their state in seceding. In May, 1861, they continued to hope that "the difficulties and disturbances now existing between the two sections of our glorious country may soon be settled without bloodshed; and the prosperity of our country may again be restored."[109] As late as May 20, 1861, they contemplated a trip to Iowa and Illinois but the outbreak of war forced its postponement.[110] Neither of the partners entered the Confederate service and both were pardoned by President Johnson on June 26, 1865.[111] Meantime, their land business in the Northwestern states was neglected, collections ceased, taxes were unpaid, many tracts were sold for taxes, and Federal attorneys took steps to confiscate their holdings. The Wisconsin lands were seized by the District Attorney and confiscation proceedings were pending in the Milwaukee court when the war ended.[112] The titles to many tracts had thus become deeply involved and it was years before they were cleared.

Unlike Easley and Willingham, Malhiot had no difficulty in continuing the management of his estates in Illinois and Louisiana, but it should be pointed out that his Louisiana plantation was within the Confederate lines for only a short period. Dr. Hamilton Griffith of Louisville, Kentucky, on the other hand, who had made a speculation in Kansas lands, was informed in 1867 that his property had been con-

[108] E. A. C. Hatch to John C. Breckinridge, St. Paul, June 20, 1869; M. D. Browning to *id.*, Burlington, June 24, 1869; J. Landler to *id.*, Prairie Du Chien, September 15, 1869; S. T. Hillis to *id.*, Watson, Illinois, September 27, 1870, Breckinridge MSS.

[109] Easley and Willingham to J. P. Casady, May 9, 1861, Letter Book, Easley MSS.

[110] James S. Easley to E. B. Stiles, May 20, 1861, *ibid.*

[111] Southerners possessing property worth over $20,000 were exempted from President Johnson's amnesty proclamation of May 29, 1865. See J. T. Dorris, "Pardon Seekers and Brokers: A Sequel to Appomattox," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), I (1935), 276 ff. Easley and Willingham wrote of their pardon in a letter of October 26, 1865, to Col. John Scott, Letter Book, Easley MSS.

[112] Joseph Harris to Easley and Willingham, Treasurers Office, Door County, Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin, September 25, 1865; Easley and Willingham to Waldo Ody and Company, December 6, 1865, Easley MSS.

demned by the Federal court but as no sale had been made the condemnation might be set aside upon presentation of his pardon.[113] Meantime, taxes and penalties which were "pretty heavy" had accumulated against the property.[114] Other Southerners who had difficulty in straightening out their land affairs were Francis and Robert Smith of Alexandria, Virginia, who, in 1866, wrote former Senator George W. Jones[115] of their "quite large" investment in Sioux City about which they were anxious and William Hurley of Henrico County who, in 1866, was in Iowa "trying to straighten up my affairs" concerning 12,000 acres of land bought in 1858.[116]

Of all the Southern investors in Northern lands, Corcoran was in the most trying position at the outbreak of the war. He had been intimate with most of the officials in Washington for a generation before and had done many favors for Whigs, Democrats, Americans, and even Republicans. Nevertheless, he was closely identified with the Southern Democrats and his sympathies were definitely with the South. But Corcoran's extensive property, then estimated at $3,000,000 to $4,000,000, was largely in Washington lots and in farming lands in the Northwest. Furthermore, many of his banking and business associates as well as political friends were Northerners. At the outbreak of the war he was in a serious dilemma, not knowing what steps to take. He opposed the breakup of the Union and was deeply shocked at the fratricidal war. His position in Washington soon became intolerable because of the suspicion to which he was subject. He was accused of being a secessionist,[117] of contributing $30,000 to the Democratic campaign fund of 1862,[118] and of contributing to the cost of constructing cruiser *No. 290,* later the *Alabama.*[119] Despairing of fair treatment at the hands of the new forces

[113] Professor Randall says "there were many forfeitures in Kansas but no proceeds turned in." *Constitutional Problems,* 290.

[114] Van Doren and Havens to Dr. Hamilton Griffith, February 1, 1867, Letter Book of Van Doren and Havens (Kansas State Historical Society Library).

[115] Francis L. Smith to George W. Jones, Alexandria, Virginia, May 2, 1866, Jones MSS.

[116] William Hurley to James S. Easley, Sidney Iowa, November 3, 1868, Easley MSS.

[117] George Morey to Governor John A. Andrew, November 21, 1861, *Official Records,* Ser. II, Vol. II, 165.

[118] New York *Herald,* October 24, 1862; New York *Times,* October 24, 1862.

[119] Hyde to Corcoran, October 13, 1863, Corcoran MSS.

in control in Washington and wearied by the constant clamor against him, Corcoran withdrew to Paris in 1862 where he remained for the duration of the war. Meantime, his art gallery was taken over by the government which needed additional office space, his other Washington property was damaged by an outraged public or rabble, easily influenced by the clamor against him, and confiscation proceedings were brought against his lands in the North. Although not pressed to conclusion, these proceedings further confused titles to much of Corcoran's property and created great difficulties for him on his return to America after the conclusion of the war.

Despite their unfortunate experiences in the management of their lands during the Civil War, at least three prominent Southern investors in Northern lands expanded their investments in the North after 1865. Corcoran made a substantial investment in Oregon in 1870; Easley and Willingham invested many thousands of dollars in tax titles in Iowa in the postwar years,[120] and Miles and Elias White entered lands in Nebraska in 1868. Some of these investments were made to recoup earlier losses but in general they seemed to indicate a feeling that land values were more certain to rise in the North and that the investments there would be more remunerative than in the South.

[120] It is interesting to note that James S. Easley did not concentrate his investments in Northern lands so completely after the war as he had in the fifties. In 1870 he invested $17,000 in the Richmond and Danville Railroad.

"The First Northern Victory"

By FRED HARVEY HARRINGTON

Father Giddings, grim, contentious dean of the Thirty-fourth House of Representatives—old Joshua Giddings, whom Douglas termed "the high priest of abolitionism"—raised his right hand to heaven.

"You do solemnly swear that you will support the Constitution of the United States, so help you God?" he asked in that booming, arrogant voice his colleagues knew so well.

"I do!" replied a handsome youngish man by Giddings' side;[1] and thus, on February 2, 1856, was ended the longest, perhaps the most important speakership contest Congress has ever known. For nine long weeks, more than a hundred thirty times the weary unpaid representatives had balloted; and, doing so, they had set a stamp upon their nation's history. Contemporaries called the outcome "the first Northern victory";[2] one of the participants lived to say, "this was the first gust, the large pelting drops, that preceded the storm of 1861";[3] and, however we discount these views, we must admit that the contest welded a very important link to the chain of movements and events that led to fratricidal war. It is worth investigating because of that, and also as an illustration of the way antislavery politicians turned what was essentially a factional fight among Northern men into an instrument of antislavery propaganda.

To tell the story of the contest, we must turn back to 1854, when the Thirty-fourth Congress came into being at the polls. It was the year of the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, which embodied the Stephen

[1] New York *Times,* February 6, 1856.

[2] See n. 72.

[3] William B. Parker, *The Life and Public Services of Justin Smith Morrill* (Boston, 1924), 68, quoting Morrill.

A. Douglas formula for settling the slavery extension question by letting the inhabitants of each territory vote the institution "up" or "down." Following the acceptance of the principle came a fiercely contested congressional campaign, with the Pierce administration Democrats defending the Nebraska Act against the attacks of antislavery-extension foes. The result, to all appearances, was a setback for the President; although the administration Democrats did manage to retain control of the Senate, there was an anti-Nebraska majority in the newly elected House. This meant that, for the first time in history, a house of Congress might have an outright antislavery-extension organization.

There were, however, factors that complicated the situation. The anti-Nebraska members were divided among themselves. In their ranks were Northern Whigs, Free Soilers, antislavery Know Nothings (or Americans), Republicans, and anti-Nebraska Democrats. And while all were opposed to the principles of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, these men were in violent disagreement on other aspects of the slavery question; they ranged all the way from Giddings, a virtual abolitionist, to near-hunker Whigs like Solomon G. Haven, Fillmore's law partner. To make matters worse, a number of them, the nativist Know Nothings, were more concerned over the foreign menace and the Papal peril than they were about the extension or existence of the South's peculiar institution. There was the real possibility that some of these representatives, hoping for antiforeign solidarity, would vote with the Southern, pro-Nebraska Americans rather than with the other antislavery-extension men. Such an alliance, in combination with the Pierce Democrats, might well result in the election of a pro-Nebraska speaker.

As the time for meeting neared, however, there seemed reason to believe that there would be a sharp division between proslavery and antislavery-extension forces on the organization question with the latter emerging victorious.[4] The settlement of Kansas and especially the activity of the emigrant aid companies had focused attention on the terri-

[4] Thomas D. Harris to Howell Cobb, October 15, 1855, in Ulrich B. Phillips (ed.), *The Correspondence of Robert Toombs, Alexander H. Stephens and Howell Cobb,* American Historical Association, *Annual Report,* 1911 (Washington, 1913), II, 355-56; Frank

torial question and had tended to iron out difficulties within Nebraska and anti-Nebraska ranks. Then, too, the prospect of an alliance of Northern and Southern Know Nothings faded in June, 1855, when the nativist national council split into proslavery and antislavery-extension groups (South and North Americans[5]) over the slavery issue. By December, there was almost no talk of nativism—it was "all nigger," as Humphrey Marshall, a leading pro-Nebraska American, expressed it.[6] Finally, the anti-Nebraska chances were improved when, just before Congress convened, the administration Democrats shut the door to the possibility of a union with the so-called South Americans by adopting a caucus resolution denouncing the Know Nothings in the severest terms.[7]

Realizing their opportunity, the antislavery-extension men prepared for action. The older congressional leaders wrote the neophytes, urging them to be in the capital in time to organize.[8] Horace Greeley and Thurlow Weed gave themselves Washington assignments for December in order that they might be on hand to work for an anti-Nebraska speaker, and Willard's Hotel and the just refurnished National buzzed with the excitement of antislavery-extension plans as the day of meeting drew near.[9]

Even so, there were signs of trouble ahead. Attempts to organize an antiadministration caucus[10] failed miserably. The only general antislavery-extension consultations brought together less than half the representatives opposed to slavery extension. These members made no caucus

Simonton, in New York *Times,* December 1, 1855; Charles Sumner to William Jay, October 7, 1855, quoted in Edward L. Pierce (ed.), *Memoir and Letters of Charles Sumner,* 4 vols. (Boston, 1877-1893), III, 420.

[5] The terms "South American" and "North American" were used in 1855 and 1856 to designate, respectively, those who accepted and those who repudiated the famous twelfth section (proslavery plank) adopted at the National American Council of June, 1855. Many Northern Know Nothings were "South Americans." Since these terms are confusing, other phrases have been substituted wherever possible.

[6] New York *Tribune,* December 6, 1855.

[7] Proposed by J. Glancy Jones of Pennsylvania, and adopted by unanimous vote. *Ibid.,* December 3, 1855.

[8] Senator Solomon Foot to Morrill, in Parker, *Justin Smith Morrill,* 62.

[9] New York *Courier and Enquirer,* November 29, 30, 1855; New York *Herald,* December 1, 1855.

[10] Horace Greeley to Schuyler Colfax, September 7, November 13, 1855, in Greeley-Colfax MSS. (New York Public Library).

nomination, contenting themselves with the adoption of Giddings' resolution by which they agreed not to support any speakership candidate who was not "pledged . . . *to organize the standing committees of the House by placing on each a majority of the friends of freedom.*"[11]

The difficulty lay in selecting a suitable candidate. Each group and subgroup had its own favorite and was not disposed to yield in the interests of harmony. To an extent, perhaps, the disagreement was one of principle; the leading anti-Nebraska nominees represented slightly different levels of antislavery thought. But more significant than these shadings were the forces of regional and personal rivalry. Not far from right was the sarcastic member from Ohio who wrote: "as near as I can ascertain there are about thirty *modest* men who think the country needs their services in the Speaker's chair. To get rid of this swarm of patriots will take time."[12]

Noon, December 3, 1855, saw a crowded, noisy House. The lobby and galleries were packed with distinguished and obscure visitors—politicians and diplomats, correspondents and members' wives, office seekers and the idly curious. One could detect a feeling of excitement, but there was no tone of bitterness, none of that tension that was to pervade the House on a like occasion in 1859. Few who witnessed the scene could have guessed that fratricidal war was only six years off.[13]

A person in the galleries, looking down on the members, could see many of established fame and many more of promise. Although the administration Democrats were in a decided minority, their ranks contained the bulk of the well-known representatives. The slender Alexander H. Stephens, his fleshless boyish face and sharp, high-pitched voice belying his years and his position as the House's best tactician, caught attention at once. One picked out other Southern Democrats: former Speaker Howell Cobb, perhaps the ablest administration leader; the

[11] Joshua Giddings to the Ashtabula *Sentinel,* December 6, 1855, quoted in the New York *Herald,* December 17, 1855.

[12] Timothy C. Day to uncle, December 6, 1855, in Sarah J. Day, *The Man on a Hill Top* (Philadelphia, 1931), 140; New York *Times,* December 11, 1855.

[13] One reporter said it was the most orderly opening day he had ever seen in Washington. New York *Commercial Advertiser,* December 4, 1855.

sharp-tongued, witty Thomas Clingman; the cheerful, brilliant James L. Orr, who was to end his days an officeholder under Grant. In Orr's state delegation was a silver-haired, bewhiskered little gentleman called William Aiken, a kindly, unassuming man who, rumor had it, owned a thousand slaves. And with Aiken was a younger South Carolinian, a gracious, handsome sixfoot specimen who looked the beau ideal of the Southern planter—Preston S. Brooks. A Southern newcomer was John A. Quitman, the sponsor of filibusters, a quiet, aging man with untrimmed hair and beard; a veteran was George Washington Jones, "Objection Jones" of the faded coat with its rusty buttons, back once again to upset treasury raids by growling "R-e-g-u-l-a-r O-r-d-e-r" from his nook in the southeast corner. William A. Richardson of Illinois, Douglas' *alter ego* and the Democratic nominee for speaker, was the best-known administration man from the Northern states; he could be seen surrounded by friends, a fat and jovial frontiersman, chewing tobacco and telling jokes. The spectators noted, too, William H. English, who was to be Winfield Scott Hancock's running mate in 1880, and the leather-lunged John Kelly of Tammany Hall.

The thirty pro-Nebraska Americans, most of whom had once been Southern Whigs, presented a less imposing spectacle. Among them were a few veterans—the bold and ponderous Humphrey Marshall, for example, and Felix K. Zollicoffer, who was to die of wounds, a Confederate general, in 1862. There were promising newcomers, but only the tall, calm Henry Winter Davis was to live up to expectations.

Most prominent among the Northern opponents of the administration was Giddings, stormy petrel of the antislavery cause, tall and sallow-faced, looking very stern and very old in his deacon's clothes. Much pointed out were the leading candidates for speaker: the slight and nervous, self-centered Lewis D. Campbell, old Ohio Whig-Free Soiler who had led the House fight against the Nebraska bill; Nathaniel P. Banks of Massachusetts, Democrat, Republican, and American rolled into one, a well-groomed, aristocratic-looking man who bore himself erect and looked about with a coolness that bordered at once on dignity and haughtiness; Alexander C. M. Pennington and Henry M. Fuller,

ex-Whig Americans from New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Besides, one could see three tall and striking first-term members, gaunt, side-whiskered Justin S. Morrill, John Sherman, who rivaled Brooks in manly beauty, and large-boned "Honest John" Covode. The scurrying, theatrical Anson Burlingame was there, as was the imposing Galusha A. Grow, with his lumberman's muscles and his bullying glare; Russell Sage and Schuyler Colfax and the three Washburn brothers; John Scott Harrison, son of one president and father of another; and Dr. Calvin C. Chaffee, who was to marry the owner of Dred Scott.

These were the abler representatives. Others, less known to fame, were to do as much to give the Thirty-fourth Congress its tone: Elisha D. Cullen and Thomas F. Bowie, for example, to be known for their appearances and speechmaking while under the influence of strong drink; and Philemon T. Herbert, who was to shoot a waiter at Willard's and go scot-free but to fall later fighting in the War between the States. There was an unusually large number of clergymen and doctors and farmers and petty politicians, men swept into Congress by the anti-Nebraska uprising and the Know Nothing movement, many of them in the position of Richard Mott of Ohio, who frankly admitted that neither he nor any one else had dreamed he would be elected. The gallery visitors might well have regarded these men with interest, for in a House where every vote counted, each was a force to be reckoned with.[14]

The balloting began very shortly after John Forney, clerk of the Thirty-third, called the House to order, and it was at once apparent how completely divided the antislavery men were.[15] No less than seventeen anti-Nebraska candidates were balloted for, and no one of them received as many as a quarter of the total votes cast. Campbell, the leading antislavery-extension candidate, trailed Richardson by over twenty votes and was sixty short of the majority needed to elect a speaker. And, what was more, four members elected as anti-Nebraska

[14] Based on contemporary newspaper accounts, the *Dictionary of American Biography,* 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), and various MSS.

[15] Greeley to Charles A. Dana, December 2, 1855, in New York *Sun,* May 19, 1889. See, also, New York *Courier and Enquirer,* December 5, 1855.

Democrats supported Richardson, while three antislavery-extension Know Nothings voted for Marshall, the South or pro-Nebraska American candidate.[16] The next three ballots brought no material change, whereupon the Richardson and Marshall men, aided by a few hungry anti-Nebraska men, forced adjournment.

Despite this showing, the majority of the antislavery-extension men were determined to continue working for union. Banks, who had been gaining in favor for days,[17] was mentioned more and more frequently as the logical antislavery-extension candidate, the man who could unite all factions and in particular capture the votes of the anti-Nebraska Democrats who would not vote for a former Whig like Campbell.[18] But, Campbell, being the leading candidate, could not be shunted aside unceremoniously. It was finally determined, at a general anti-Nebraska conference, to force the Ohioan as high as possible and then, if it was shown he could not be elected, try Banks, and, Banks failing, Pennington.[19]

The plan was tried on December 5, the third day of balloting. Campbell, starting with forty-eight votes, rocketed to seventy-five on the third (twelfth) ballot, reaching eighty-one before the day had closed, as Banks fell from thirty-seven to eight. But eighty-one votes was thirty short of a majority. The conservative antislavery-extension men who were backing Fuller would not join the movement, and the anti-Nebraska Democrats were also adamant. Besides, Campbell could not hold the votes he had obtained. His support crumbled the next morning, and he soon fell to forty-six votes, his lowest level of the contest.

Plainly it was time to try Banks or Pennington; but factional jealousies interfered. It was not a difference of opinion on a matter of

[16] Statistics and analyses based on records of votes in *Congressional Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 3-337 (December 3, 1855-February 2, 1856).

[17] New York *Herald,* December 3, 1855; New York *Tribune,* December 1, 3, 4, 1855.

[18] New York *Courier and Enquirer,* December 3, 1855; New York *Tribune,* December 3, 4, 1855; New York *Herald,* December 3, 4, 1855. But, see Greeley to Dana, December 1, 1855, in New York *Sun,* May 19, 1889 ("I am doing what I can for Banks; but he won't be Speaker"); New York *Courier and Enquirer,* December 6, 7, 1855.

[19] Giddings to the Ashtabula *Sentinel,* December 6, 1855, quoted in the New York *Herald,* December 31, 1855.

principle. It was merely that Campbell had not yet abandoned hope and that the Banks men, fearing Pennington, suggested that the New Jersey man be tried (and killed off) first, thus leaving the field to Banks.[20] In the confusion it was decided to try Campbell again. This drive failed dismally, and the Ohioan withdrew from the race; but he did so with bad grace, making it plain that he felt badly used.[21] For the duration of the contest he brooded on his defeat and frequently, quite obviously in spite, voted against his antislavery-extension colleagues. Thus does ambition temper doctrine.

The anti-Nebraska men felt relieved when Campbell withdrew; some murmured, "This will decide the question."[22] But the next roll call showed no concentration of antislavery-extension strength; Banks, the leading antiadministration candidate, had barely forty votes. Even after a night of conferences,[23] he was still short of a majority. Still, some progress was made. On December 8, the Massachusetts man spurted from eighty-six to a hundred votes, and two days later he picked up seven more to come within a half dozen votes of victory. There he stuck.

Campbell, eating his heart out with chagrin, now termed Banks a "dead cock in the pit,"[24] and the Pennington men clamored for their turn. But wiser counsels prevailed. The Pennington men were voted down in caucus and Banks was made the official nominee of the anti-Nebraska forces.[25]

There were now two major tasks before the antislavery men—keeping their lines intact and winning over the anti-Nebraska representatives who refused to vote for Banks. In neither case was the task an easy one. In and out of the Banks column were many antislavery men who thought

[20] New York *Herald,* December 12, 31 (quoting Giddings), 1855. Note, also, New York *Courier and Enquirer,* December 6, 7, 1855.

[21] See his hint that other antislavery candidates were prepared to sacrifice principle or make committee commitments. *Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 11 (December 7, 1855); New York *Herald,* December 6, 8, 1855; New York *Courier and Enquirer,* December 28, 1855; New York *Times,* January 30, 1856.

[22] New York *Herald,* December 8, 1855.

[23] *Ibid.,* December 31, 1855, quoting Giddings.

[24] *Ibid.,* December 11, 1855.

[25] *Ibid.,* December 15, 1855; New York *Times,* December 15, 1855; New York *Tribune,* December 15, 1855.

Banks too extreme or too mild a candidate. There were anti-Nebraska Americans who quite correctly questioned the sincerity of his nativism. There were protectionists who thought him a free trader, members who disliked him personally, men who craved the speakership or wanted the credit of casting the deciding vote, representatives who stayed away because they were irritated at the New York *Tribune's* acid comments about members who hesitated to vote for Banks. And lastly, there were the Fuller men.

For, while Banks was driving towards a hundred votes, Fuller was deserting the anti-Nebraska cause. Perhaps, feeling himself unappreciated by his anti-Nebraska colleagues, the Pennsylvanian saw a chance to win the speakership by building a combination of the pro-Nebraska Americans, the administration Democrats, and his personal friends. At any rate, he begin flirting with Marshall and Richardson representatives as early as the sixth of December;[26] and by the eighth, to the amazement of observers, he had become the pro-Nebraska Know Nothing candidate for speaker.[27] True, he lost most of his antislavery-extension backers in the process,[28] but he retained enough to cause the Banks men much concern. After all, Banks needed less than half a dozen votes to win.

To their credit as politicians, it may be said that the Banks men managed the situation very well. Their candidate did his bit. He looked the part and, in spite of obstacles and insults, displayed a composure that stirred both friend and foe to admiration.[29] At the same time, he worked constantly in his own interests. When assailed as an extremist, he denied connection with the abolitionists, repudiated the sentiments of a speech in which he had said, "I am not one of that class of men who cry for the perpetuation of the Union. . . . I am willing in a certain

[26] New York *Herald,* December 8, 1855; New York *Tribune,* December 7, 1855.

[27] Some pro-Nebraska Americans may have supported Fuller to prevent Fuller's Northern supporters from stampeding to Banks. New York *Tribune,* December 10, 1855.

[28] Note their December 5 attitude to observe suddenness of shift. *Ibid.,* December 6, 1855; New York *Times,* December 6, 1855.

[29] Charles F. Adams: "If I was [*sic*] in your place, I should not be able to stand the insulting mode in which they attack you." Banks: "Oh, it is the easiest thing in life to me; I can bear it." Boston *Traveller,* February 29, 1856, quoting speech by Adams; New York *Herald,* December 11, 23, 1855; Boston *Journal,* January 14, 1856.

set of circumstances to 'let it slide,' "[30] and gave private assurances that brought at least one wavering representative into line.[31] When scattering antislavery-extension members raised the opposite objection—that the Massachusetts man was halfhearted in his opposition to human bondage—he publicly proclaimed that he was the true representative of "the strongest anti-slavery district in the United States."[32] He wisely asserted his ignorance of bargains entered into by his followers but was ready enough to write letters and sign petitions defending the course of any supporter who was under fire.[33]

Naturally, however, it was Banks' sponsors who did the spade work for the cause. A steering group, led by Burlingame, Colfax, and the Washburns, met every other night to map out plans for action; and when there was danger of a bolt, these men saw to it that the prospective bolters had showers of letters and telegrams from their constituencies, urging them to "stick to Banks."[34] There was much missionary work among the intransigent antislavery-extension men who held out against the Massachusetts candidate. James Buffington and Timothy Davis, popular Bay State Americans, moved among the Know Nothings. Giddings talked to Western protectionists like Harrison. Burlingame, Greeley, and Senator Henry Wilson were everywhere, cajoling, threatening, rounding up members for the roll calls. Banks representatives made offers of committee posts, and there was even talk of bribery. Banks had a slippery lobby agent, S. P. Hanscom, who did most effective work —possibly it was he who led Greeley to remark, privately, that he began "to see the utility of rascals in the general economy of things."[35]

[30] Banks' famous "Union Slide" speech, clipping, Maine newspaper, summer, 1855, in Banks Scrapbooks, Essex Institute, Salem, Massachusetts (property of Mrs. Harold Page, Melrose, Massachusetts); *Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 75 (December 24, 1855).

[31] Edward Ball to Banks, December 10, 1855, in Banks MSS. Note Ball's votes after this date.

[32] *Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 28, 31, 32 (December 15, 17, 1855).

[33] Banks to an editor, January 4, 1856, Banks MSS.; New York *Tribune,* January 31, 1856.

[34] Schuyler Colfax, "Anson Burlingame," in the *Independent* (New York, Boston, 1848-), XXIII (1870), 87, listing Galusha A. Grow, Benjamin Stanton, William A. Howard, Anson Morrill, Francis E. Spinner, Aaron H. Cragin, Mason W. Tappan, and others; Day to John Bigelow, December 30, 1855, Bigelow MSS. (New York Public Library).

[35] Boston *Journal,* January 15, February 6, 1856; New York *Herald,* December 31, 1855,

Far more important was the way the Banks men used the contest to build up antislavery sentiment in the North. In Washington, one observed no death struggle between North and South; the whole thing appeared as a family fight among the anti-Nebraska men. But the antislavery-extension journalists and politicians, seeing their opportunity, began to picture the conflict as one between freedom and slavery, to brand the anti-Nebraska men who opposed Banks as "doughfaces," men who had sold out to the proslavery members. And these efforts met with success. Letters poured in advising congressmen to "stick to Banks," to stave off the "Slave Power" even if it meant balloting till March 4, 1857.[36] Undoubtedly, the contest tightened the hitherto scattered ranks of the anti-Nebraska men, and helped pave the way for the formation of a national antislavery-extension organization. It was during the contest, in the Christmas holidays at the Silver Springs conference,[37] that the antiadministration leaders began working for such a party. One understands why the Massachusetts antislavery-extension editor Samuel Bowles wrote Colfax: "God bless all you good fellows at Washington! You are making a great fight, and one of more importance and of vaster consequence than most people imagine. It is settling the next Presidential election and the new order of things, politically, for the next generation."[38]

quoting Giddings; *Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 89-90 (December 27, 1855); Greeley to Dana, February 16, 1856, in New York *Sun,* May 19, 1889; James F. Rhodes, *History of the United States,* 9 vols. (New York, 1920), II, 72, citing H. H. Bancroft; John Savage, *Our Living Representative Men* (Philadelphia, 1860), 31; Benjamin Perley Poore, *Perley's Reminiscences of Sixty Years in the National Metropolis,* 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1886), I, 453.

[36] Edward Kent to Israel Washburn, December 15, 1855, in Gaillard Hunt, *Israel, Elihu and Cadwallader Washburn* (New York, 1925), 39; T. D. Eliot to Charles Sumner, January 10, 1856, Sumner MSS. (Harvard University Library); George Roberts to Banks, February 4, 1856, Banks MSS.; J. B. Russell to Day, January 12, 1856, in Day, *Man on a Hill Top,* 145; Theodore Parker to Sumner, January 14, 1856, in John Weiss, *Letters and Correspondence of Theodore Parker,* 2 vols. (New York, 1864), II, 159; New York *Times,* January 3 (with offer of loan to Banks), 4, 1856.

[37] See William E. Smith, *The Francis Preston Blair Family in Politics,* 2 vols. (New York, 1933), II, 323-24; Frederick W. Seward, *Seward at Washington,* 3 vols. (New York, 1891), II, 264.

[38] Samuel Bowles to Colfax, in O. J. Hollister, *Life of Schuyler Colfax* (New York, 1886), 87; Israel D. Andrews to Banks, January 12, 1856, and James M. Stone to Banks, January 25, 1856 ("Don't waver. The more votes for Speaker the better. The lines be-

Through December and into January, the contest wore on. In retrospect, it seemed exciting;[39] actually, it was often dull.[40] Washington in the fifties was no pleasant place at best, and it was not at its best with the members unpaid, some unable to pay for tobacco, and the temperature falling to six below zero. Distinguished visitors like former Speaker Andrew Stevenson, Salmon P. Chase, Thomas H. Benton, and Reverdy Johnson found little to write home about, with Banks holding his hundred votes, Richardson his seventy-odd, Fuller his score and a half, with a dozen scattering. Sometimes the end seemed in sight, but time and again hopes for an election proved illusory.[41]

As might have been expected, the air was full of schemes designed to force an organization. One member proposed that no one "be allowed to indulge in the use of meat, drink, fire, or other refreshments, gaslight and water only excepted, until an election of Speaker shall be effected." Another wanted each member balloted on in alphabetical order until some one secured a majority, a third suggested that every one resign and face a new election, while several thought it might be wise to take as speaker some nonmember. More sensible were the recurrent proposals for longer or continuous sessions, for the curtailment or prohibition of debate, for the appointment of a temporary speaker, and for election by plurality vote. Naturally, the plurality plan was the favorite of the Banks forces, and it was brought forth no less than fifteen times during the contest.[42]

By Christmas, the administration men began talking of favoring a continuous session and the plurality rule. They were tiring of the contest, Pierce was anxious to send in his message, and there seemed a

tween the parties will be more firmly consolidated"), Banks MSS.; Giddings to daughter, February 1, 1856, Giddings-Julian MSS. (Library of Congress).

[39] John W. Forney, *Anecdotes of Public Men* (New York, 1873), 373; and, especially, Colfax, "Anson Burlingame," *loc. cit.*, 87, for colorful, inaccurate descriptions.

[40] Senator William P. Fessenden to son, December, 1855, in Francis Fessenden, *Life and Public Services of William Pitt Fessenden,* 2 vols. (Boston, 1907), I, 70.

[41] See Howell Cobb to Mrs. Cobb, December 23, 1855, in Phillips (ed.), *Correspondence of Toombs, Stephens and Cobb,* 356; New York *Times,* December 28, 1855.

[42] *Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 34, 72, 139, 149, 235, 241 (December 17, 22, 1855; January 3, 4, 16, 1856); also, *ibid.,* 84-85 (December 26, 1855), for Lewis D. Campbell's interesting motion to make James L. Orr temporary speaker; New York *Courier and Enquirer,* December 24, 1855.

possibility of a Democratic victory if the pro-Nebraska Americans and other Fuller men were forced to choose between Richardson and Banks. But Stephens convinced Pierce he could send in his message anyway, and the Democratic caucus voted down the plurality rule.[43]

January brought dramatic interludes—an all-night session and a "catechism." The first, which took place on January 9-10, was proposed by Democratic leaders, mainly to keep restive followers from voting for election by plurality.[44] It accomplished this purpose, but no one lost and no one gained through eighteen hours of roll calls and buncombe oratory. By two in the morning the House dining counter was running low on provisions, and soon the hungry members had to content themselves with ginger cakes and coffee. Four o'clock saw the galleries thinning, the ill congressmen pairing off, and pages tying drowsy members to their chairs. At eight the pro-Nebraska men—Democrats, pro-slavery Americans, and Fuller men alike—united to vote adjournment.

Close on the night session came the "catechism." Originating in a desire of Southern Americans to embarrass Richardson,[45] it developed into an investigation of the political views of the leading candidates. Before it was over, each had replied to two lists of questions covering such matters as slavery in the territories and the District of Columbia, the Fugitive Slave law, Know Nothingism, and the relative merits of the white and Negro races.[46]

In their replies, Richardson and Fuller defended the Kansas-Nebraska Act as just to North and South alike, while Banks denounced it, stating it opened to slavery land consecrated to freedom in 1820. The Massachusetts man declared the Wilmot Proviso constitutional, said the Con-

[43] Stephens to brother, December 30, 1855, in Richard M. Johnston and William H. Browne, *Life of Alexander H. Stephens* (Philadelphia, 1878), 300-301; New York *Tribune,* December 29, 31, 1855. Stephens' plurality resolution passed but was rescinded immediately by Banks votes because Campbell brought forward a motion to make Orr temporary speaker.

[44] Boston *Journal,* January 14, 1856; New York *Times,* January 12, 1856; New York *Tribune,* January 10, 11, 14, 1856; Morrill to Mrs. Morrill, January 10, 1856, in Parker, *Justin Smith Morrill,* 63; Colfax's letter, in Hollister, *Schuyler Colfax,* 88; Stephens to brother, January 8, 1856, Johnston and Browne, *Alexander H. Stephens,* 302.

[45] Also to kill time. New York *Courier and Enquirer,* January 14, 1856.

[46] *Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 222-28 (January 12, 1856), for questions and answers.

stitution did not follow the flag, and maintained Congress had power to prohibit slavery in the territories. Fuller took the opposite view, denying Congress and the territorial legislatures power to legislate at all on slavery in the territories, except to protect the property of slaveowners. Richardson compromised, stating that the Constitution and Fugitive Slave law applied to the territories while hedging on the question of the constitutionality of the Wilmot Proviso and asserting that the Constitution did not carry slavery into the territories. Fuller and Richardson both voiced opposition to abolition of slavery in the District and both stated that the Negro was inferior to the white man; Banks declined to answer the District question and dismissed the second question by alluding to the Declaration of Independence and proposing "to wait until time should determine the superiority of the black or the white race, by one of them absorbing the other."[47] He half dodged the Know Nothing query by referring to his record while Richardson attacked and Fuller defended nativism.

The catechism affected the fortune of each candidate. The Democratic ultras were offended at Richardson's failure to declare the Wilmot Proviso unconstitutional, and three South Carolinians deserted him on the next (108th) roll call.[48] Banks found himself so assailed as an "amalgamationist" that he publicly corrected his remarks on race absorption; but meanwhile he had frightened moderates and hurt the chances for the passage of a plurality resolution.[49] And Fuller had strengthened his hold on the pro-Nebraska Americans; on the next ballot he equalled his previous high, while Richardson and Banks were nine and thirteen respectively behind their record totals.

The Democrats made the next move. Pressed by Pierce,[50] and realiz-

[47] Uncorrected account, in Boston *Journal,* January 15, 1856. Perhaps intended as a jest, Banks' statement was greeted with roars of laughter. *Ibid.; Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 227 (January 12, 1856); New York *Evening Post,* January 14, 1856.

[48] New York *Evening Post,* January 15, 1856; New York *Times,* January 17, 1856. "By G-d, we've been voting for a free soiler all along," said one.

[49] *Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 233-34, 253 (January 15, 18, 1856); New York *Day Book,* January 15, 1856; New York *Courier and Enquirer,* January 16, 1856; New York *Herald,* January 15, 18, 1856; Boston *Journal,* January 18, 22, 1856.

[50] Washington *National Intelligencer,* January 3, 7, 23, 1856, shows a type of intraparty pressure.

ing the need of some sort of organization to enable the administration to carry on its normal functions, they moved to compromise. If the antislavery-extension men would withdraw Banks, they said, they would vote for a plurality resolution.[51] When the anti-Nebraska leaders would not give ground, Albert Rust, a burly, first-term Democrat from Arkansas, introduced a resolution to force compliance—one that implied that personal ambitions stood in the way of organization and called for the withdrawal of the leading candidates. Aimed at Banks, the resolution missed its target; the Massachusetts man held his ground, and on January 23 his friends, with the aid of half a dozen administration Democrats, managed to get the resolution shelved.[52] It did, however, lead to the substitution of Orr for Richardson as the Democratic candidate.[53]

From this time on, attention centered on efforts to force through the plurality rule. There were distractions—some general votes on questions of principle, Rust's attack on Greeley for denouncing the Arkansas member's resolution—but discussion always reverted to the plurality matter. Administration men as well as Banks members began to support it at last. On January 30, Clingman moved it, in the 1849 form (a plurality to elect on the fourth successive roll call if no one obtained a majority before that time) and five party colleagues joined the North Carolinian in its support. It was defeated, but by a narrow margin, 106 to 110. The next day it was closer still, 108 to 110, and its eventual passage seemed assured.

Noting the circumstances, Stephens concocted a plan. The Democrats would let the plurality rule pass, have two ballots under it and then, if the pro-Nebraska Americans failed to go to Orr (a convinced opponent of nativism), substitute William Aiken, a Pierce man who did not attend Democratic caucuses and had not committed himself against the Know Nothings. The plan was privately endorsed by Democratic and

[51] Sumner to Parker, January 20, 1856, in Pierce (ed.), *Charles Sumner,* III, 426; rejected at two party caucuses, New York *Times,* January 17, 1856; New York *Tribune,* January 21, 1856.

[52] *Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 280, 283 (January 23, 1856). Probably formulated by Stephens, Thomas L. Clingman, Humphrey Marshall, and George Dunn. See Greeley, in New York *Tribune,* January 23, 1856.

[53] New York *Tribune,* January 24, 1856, including account of Banks caucuses.

Southern American leaders and might well have succeeded in giving the House an administration speaker had it been kept secret. But on February 1, before the plurality resolution had been adopted, Kelly of New York and Williamson R. W. Cobb of Alabama moved that Aiken be elected speaker. The members not being under the pressure of plurality, the motion failed, 103 to 110, and the golden opportunity for a surprise victory was gone.[54]

Even so, there seemed more than an outside chance that Aiken could beat Banks under a plurality rule. He had secured 103 votes on the motion to declare him speaker, whereas Banks had received but 100 on a similar motion a few minutes before.[55] Aiken had effected a coalition of the Democratic, Fuller, and Southern American pro-Nebraska groups and appealed to certain members who had hitherto thrown their votes away. Thus it was that Joshua Giddings tossed sleeplessly on his bed that night of February 1, and President Pierce, spying Aiken at the White House reception, addressed the white-haired planter as "Mr. Speaker."[56]

The House was packed the next morning, for every one felt the contest would be decided that day. Both sides seemed confident when Pierce's friend, Samuel A. Smith, moved the familiar plurality resolution, calling for plurality election on the fourth successive ballot. The motion prevailed, 113 to 104, as 9 Pierce Democrats and 1 Fuller man joined the Banks group in the majority.[57] Attempts to rescind or force adjournment were unsuccessful, and the final balloting began.

On the first (130th) ballot Banks had 102 votes, Aiken 93, while 14 Know Nothings clung to Fuller, and 6 members scattered. The next

[54] Stephens to brother, February 1, 1856, in Johnston and Browne, *Alexander H. Stephens,* 305-306; *Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 334-35 (February 1, 1856). Kelly anticipated Cobb, but the vote was on Cobb's resolution.

[55] There is evidence, however, that this was arranged by the Banks men to lead their foes to adopt the plurality rule. Jacob Broom to Banks, August 11, 1858, Banks MSS., indicating that Broom and Thomas R. Whitney changed from nay to aye on that resolution to "make a larger vote on that resolution than on the one declaring you Speaker" and lead the Democrats "to the adoption of the plurality rule, which at last put an end to the agony of the contest."

[56] Giddings to daughter, February 9, 1856, Giddings-Julian MSS.; New York *Commercial Advertiser,* February 6, 1856; New York *Times,* February 6, 1856.

[57] *Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 335 (February 2, 1856). Greeley claimed other Democrats would have joined had their votes been needed (New York *Tribune,* February

roll call brought no change of consequence, a motion for adjournment failed, and the third ballot was taken, Aiken falling off one vote. Again a few Democrats and pro-Nebraska Americans pressed for adjournment; again they were outvoted, and the roll was called once more, for the 133rd ballot, the last under Smith's resolution.

Acting under pressure and assured that Aiken was not antinativist,[58] seven pro-Nebraska Know Nothings now switched to the Carolinian. But seven were not enough. Five Americans who had supported the Aiken resolution the night before voted for Fuller or abstained.[59] One Pierce Democrat withheld, another wasted his vote because of dislike for associating with Know Nothings. Threats and entreaties were of no avail. A Fuller man, asked to switch to Aiken to save the Union, replied "I'll be —— if I do!" No change was made even as Samuel P. Benson, the anti-Nebraska teller, rose to announce the result. There was only a cry of "Licked, by thunder!" from a Southern representative and "Got 'em, boys" from a Banks man. The Clerk bawled for order, and Benson stated the result: Banks, 103, Aiken, 100, Fuller, 6, Campbell, 4, and Daniel Wells, 1.[60]

The announcement was greeted with wild applause,[61] but the contest was not quite over. Some of the minority claimed there had been no election, that the House must adopt a resolution declaring Banks elected before he could serve. The resulting confusion was not resolved until Aiken, like the true gentleman he was, asked permission to escort Banks to the chair. The request was met with shouts of approval, and the House soon declared in formal resolution that Banks had been elected speaker.[62]

6, 1856), but this does not mean that the entire party favored the move. William W. Boyce and George W. Jones fought vigorously for reconsideration.

[58] *Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 86, 338, insert, 355 (February 2, 4, 1856), for account of last minute assurances Aiken gave Alexander K. Marshall, Kentucky American.

[59] See n. 55.

[60] *Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 335-36 (February 2, 1856); New York *Times,* February 6, 1856.

[61] Giddings to daughter, February 3, 1856, Giddings-Julian MSS.; New York *Times,* February 6, 1856; Morrill to Mrs. Morrill, February 3, 1856, in Parker, *Justin Smith Morrill,* 74. These statements do not square with Colfax, "Anson Burlingame," *loc cit.,* 87, which inaccurately pictures the 1856 gallery as "Slave Power" dominated.

[62] *Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 342 (February 2, 1856). The vote: 155 to 40, with

The formalities remained, and they were impressive ones. Banks, with his politician's sense and a flair for the theatrical, did not stop on the steps as his predecessors had done—he walked up and placed his hand on the speaker's desk. As he did so, the Sergeant-at-Arms elevated the mace for the first time that session, Forney passed up the gavel, and Giddings prepared to administer the oath.[63] The speakership contest was over.

Throughout the country the result was viewed in many lights. Most Southern Democrats saw it as a triumph of abolitionism, a sign of trouble ahead. Stephens termed it the first purely sectional triumph in a speakership contest,[64] while Robert Toombs wrote, "The election of Banks has given great hopes to our enemies, and their policy is dangerous in the extreme to us."[65] Others went further still. The Charleston *Mercury,* speaking of the victor, said, "never will conscience, or justice, or the Constitution, obtrude their voice in the execution of his appointed task. The creature of party, and the tool of fanaticism, who can foretell his course?"[66]

There were those among the Democrats and pro-Nebraska Americans who looked on Banks' victory as a misfortune rather than a calamity. Pierce's organ, the Washington *Union,* stated that "although the result is one which every national man will regret, yet . . . there is reason for acquiescing, inasmuch as it enables the machinery of government to

Southern Americans and malcontents like Albert Rust making up the minority. Morrill to Mrs. Morrill, February 3, 1856, in Parker, *Justin Smith Morrill,* 74: "They fought us at every step, and even after Banks was elected continued the fight, a portion of them, for two hours like graceless, bully blackguards."

[63] Samuel C. Busey, *Personal Reminiscences and Recollections* (Washington, 1895); Forney, *Anecdotes of Public Men,* 381; Sumner to Adams, February 5, 1856, in Pierce (ed.), *Charles Sumner,* III, 451; New York *Evening Post,* September 9, 1857; *Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 343 (February 4, 1856); Giddings to daughter, February 3, 1856, Giddings-Julian MSS.; Simonton, in New York *Times,* February 6, 1856.

[64] Stephens to brother, in Johnston and Browne, *Alexander H. Stephens,* 305. Note that Banks "avoided the usual pledge to save the Union," according to Simonton, in New York *Times,* February 6, 1856.

[65] Toombs to Thomas W. Thomas, February 9, 1856, in Phillips (ed.), *Correspondence of Toombs, Stephens and Cobb,* 361.

[66] Quoted in New York *Times,* February 9, 1856; also, New York *Evening Post,* February 8, 1856, and New York *Courier and Enquirer,* February 14, 1856, quoting Southern newspapers.

move on."[67] And the editors of other papers, including the Louisville *Journal,* the Baltimore *Patriot,* and the *National Intelligencer,* rejoiced that the long ordeal was over.[68]

To the antislavery men, the victory seemed a stupendous one. Hundred gun salutes were fired in Maine, in Massachusetts, and in Illinois.[69] Congratulations poured in from every Northern state,[70] and journalists and politicians wrote poetically of the result: "on Saturday we were in the wood, the dark and dreary forest was around us," wrote Giddings, "but on Monday we were in the promised land which flowed with milk and honey."[71]

Those who rejoiced harped on one theme—the sectional character of the victory. To them, the contest seemed, not a factional brawl among the antiadministration men, but a glorious struggle with the forces of slavery. "There *is* a North!" they cried. "For once in forty years the North has exhibited something of manly strength." "Banks' election is the first victory of the Northern idea since 1787."[72]

Most of all, it was the future that intrigued these celebrators. "The North has obtained . . . a victory which is principally valuable as the key and precursor to a perpetual supremacy over the national government," said the New York *Evening Post.* Giddings, reviewing the contest, wrote, "we have got our party formed, consolidated and established"; and the astute Thurlow Weed commented, "This triumph is

[67] Washington *Union,* February 4, 1856, quoted in New York *Times,* February 5, 1856.

[68] Washington *National Intelligencer,* February 4, 1856; Louisville *Journal* and Baltimore *Patriot,* both quoted in New York *Evening Post,* February 9, 1856, believed Banks could do little harm; *Wochenblatt der Neu-Yorker Staats-Zeitung,* February 9, 1856, Democratic, deplored the election as a Know Nothing triumph; a New York *Herald* correspondent noted lack of interest in Mobile, Alabama. New York *Herald,* February 12, 1856.

[69] New York *Times,* February 5, 6, 1856.

[70] Banks MSS. contain many of these letters.

[71] Giddings to daughter, February 9, 1856, Giddings-Julian MSS. See, also, *id.* to *id.,* February 3, 1856.

[72] Simonton, in New York *Times,* February 4, 1856; Morrill to Mrs. Morrill, February 3, 1856, in Parker, *Justin Smith Morrill,* 75; Parker to Sumner, February 16, 1856, in Pierce (ed.), *Charles Sumner,* III, 427; Sumner to Adams, February 5, 1856, *ibid.,* 431; George Livermore to Sumner, February 4, 1856, Sumner MSS.; Dorris Clark to Banks, Banks MSS.; Israel Washburn, Jr., quoted in Boston *Journal,* October 10, 1857; Sumner to Massachusetts Committee, February 25, 1856, in Charles Sumner, *The Complete Works of Charles Sumner,* 15 vols. (Boston, 1900), V, 97.

worth all it cost in time, toil, and solicitude . . . [for] the Republican party is now inaugurated. We can work with a will."[73]

In time, men ceased to think of the contest in their excitement over other things, in their interest in bleeding Kansas and Preston Brooks and the Buchanan-Frémont campaign. But, beyond question, the nine weeks of struggle had done much to North and South. It had all but killed Know Nothingism in the North, by causing the anti-Nebraska Americans to cast their lot with other, nonnativist, antislavery factions.[74] It had served to demonstrate that, in the last resort, the pro-Nebraska Americans were allies of the Southern Democrats. It had created ill-feeling between the sections. In December, Fayette McMullen of Virginia had been greeted with roars of laughter when he had threatened Southern secession if the Missouri Compromise was restored or the Fugitive Slave law repealed.[75] In January, a new bitterness could be seen in Rust's assault on Greeley, in Bowie's bellowed threats in the barrooms, and in the fact that Northern men were buying pistols.[76] For, faction fight though it had been in its inception, the speakership contest had served to increase sectional hostility. One could read the dismal future in the comment of William Lloyd Garrison in his *Liberator.* "Let us hope," wrote the abolitionist, "that this result is but the first gun at Lexington of the new Revolution. If so, then Bunker Hill and Yorktown are before us! All we have to do is press onward—right onward!"[77] Onward to war.

[73] New York *Evening Post,* February 8, 1856; Giddings to daughter, February 1, 1856, Giddings-Julian MSS.; Thurlow Weed to Banks, February 3, 1856, Banks MSS.

[74] See Stone to Banks, December 8, 1855, Banks MSS., of Banks and the anti-Nebraska Americans, "your election makes their cake dough next year."

[75] *Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 61 (December 20, 1855); New York *Tribune,* December 24, 1855.

[76] Greeley to Dana, January 30, 1856, in New York *Sun,* May 19, 1889; Parker, *Justin Smith Morrill,* 63, noting Spinner's estimate that there were 300 loaded pistols in the hall and galleries one day.

[77] Boston *Liberator,* February 8, 1856. See, also, B. Rush Plumly to Banks, March 27, 1856, Banks MSS., for Wendell Phillips' favorable reaction. The "first Republican victory" tradition can be seen in Boston *Journal,* February 14, 1856; John Bigelow, *Retrospections of an Active Life,* 4 vols. (New York, 1909-1913), I, 141; Horace Greeley, *Recollections of a Busy Life* (New York, 1873), 351-52; Rhodes, *History of the United States,* II, 74; Arthur C. Cole, *The Era of the Civil War, 1848-1870, The Centennial History of Illinois,* III (Springfield, 1919), 142; George H. Haynes, "Nathaniel P. Banks," in *Dictionary of American Biography,* I, 577-80.

The Slave Insurrection Panic of 1856

By HARVEY WISH

In the fall of 1856 a series of startling allegations regarding numerous slave insurrections broke through the habitual reserve maintained on the topic by the Southern press. Wild rumors of an all-embracing slave plot extending from Delaware to Texas, with execution set for Christmas day, spread through the South. Tales were yet unforgotten of Gabriel's "army" attempting to march on Richmond in 1800, of Denmark Vesey's elaborate designs upon Charleston in 1822, of Nat Turner's bloody insurrection at Southampton, Virginia, in 1831, and of the various other plots and outbreaks that characterized American slavery since the days of the early slave ship mutinies.[1] Silence in the press could not stem the recurrent fears of insurrection transmitted by the effective "grapevine" intelligence of the South.

Sectional passions were stirred almost to the bursting point in the year of the Buchanan-Frémont presidential election. The provocative events in "bleeding Kansas," intensified by extremists on both sides, revealed a miniature civil war that was prophetic of worse things to come; the assault on Senator Charles Sumner by Preston Brooks of South Carolina furnished a fresh opportunity for displaying mutual hatreds; abolitionists and Southern extremists vied with each other in "dis-unionist conventions"; and unwittingly the Supreme Court poured oil on these flames in the Dred Scott hearings. New economic factors further complicated the situation as the final months of a boom era brought the price of slaves to high levels, inspiring a proposal by Governor James H.

[1] For a summary of slave plots and slave ship mutinies, see the writer's article, "American Slave Insurrections Before 1861," in *Journal of Negro History* (Lancaster, Pa., Washington, 1916-), XXII (1937), 299-320.

Adams of South Carolina that the foreign slave trade be reopened.[2] Although this suggestion became the target of severe criticisms within the South itself, the Northern press regarded it as a fresh provocation.

Worst of all for the cause of conciliation in the eyes of Northern moderates as well as Southerners appeared the ominous rise of the frankly sectional Republican party in 1856 to a position challenging national control. The presidential candidacy of John C. Frémont, like that of Abraham Lincoln in 1860, lent itself to opponents' charges of hostility to the South and seemed to sanction threats of disunion. Contemporary opinion, with remarkably few exceptions, attributed the revival of slave plots to the excitement wrought by the national election. The New York *Herald* of December 11, 1856, editorializing on the numerous slave plots, declared:

> The simultaneous discovery of similar plots in various localities, remote from each other, can only be accounted for upon the hypothesis of some general delusion lately diffused throughout the South, and acted upon spontaneously here and there, by the negroes themselves. . . . The idea, no doubt, was that with Fremont's election all the negroes of the South would be instantly emancipated or supported from the North in a bloody revolt.

Likewise the Manchester *Guardian* of December 23, observing the American scene, showed an intimate knowledge of the prevailing election excitement in the South:

> The ferment excited in the minds of the masters soon extended itself to the slaves—for all who have lived in slave-holding communities well know how eagerly every scrap of parlor conversation, every excited harangue on the stump, or loud-toned dispute in the streets, is treasured by the negro and made the burden of kitchen comment during the hours of the night.[3]

Early reports of slave plots, partially disregarded before election day, revealed that several Texas counties had organized "Vigilance Com-

[2] The rising price of slaves was the subject of considerable newspaper comment in 1856. The firm of Dickinson, Hill, and Company, auctioneers of Richmond, Virginia, declared that the gross amount of their Negro sales for that year had reached the enormous sum of two million dollars and that the total for all Richmond houses was approximately twice that much. A Negro carpenter brought $1,615, and a woman of fifty to sixty years of age sold for $725 cash. New York *Herald,* January 16, 1857.

[3] Editorial reprinted in *ibid.,* January 10, 1857. Frederick Law Olmsted, visiting the Lower South at this time, attributed the insurrections of 1856 to the incendiary remarks

mittees" upon the popular California model to investigate alarming tales of insurrection. A committee at Columbus, Colorado County, in the southeastern part of the state, wrote to the Galveston *News* on September 9 that they had discovered a well-organized plot to murder the entire white population. The slaves had in their possession large quantities of pistols, bowie knives, guns, and ammunition. A fantastic conspiratorial organization existed among them with the significant password, "Leave not a shadow behind." At a late hour of September 6 all were to make a simultaneous effort to kill the whites except for certain favored individuals. Two or more slaves were to be apportioned to each house for this purpose. Afterwards they would capture the horses about Columbus and fight their way to freedom in Mexico. More than two hundred Negroes and the entire Mexican element in the county appeared to be involved. There was no definite proof against the Mexicans although there were certain inferences. One of their number, a certain Frank, was believed to be the instigator of the plot. The committee passed a resolution "forever forbidding any Mexican from coming within the limits of the county." All resident Mexicans were ordered to leave the county within five days and never to return on penalty of death. Two Negroes were whipped to death and three others hanged.[4] From the postmaster at Hallettsville, in adjacent Lavaca County, came the details of a proposed slave revolt under an Ohio abolitionist named Davidson and two others who were to lead the slaves to kill their masters, and to seize all available arms and ammunition for a flight to Mexico. Davidson was captured and confessed to the committee that the plot was planned for October 31.[5] He was given a hundred lashes for his part in the conspiracy.[6] During the panic a statement was issued from Harrison County, on the Louisiana border, that the rumors of insurrec-

made during the presidential election by ambitious Southern politicians who misrepresented the effects of a Frémont victory. *A Journey Through Texas* (New York, 1857), xxiv.

[4] New York *Tribune,* November 1, 1856; Boston *Liberator,* October 3, 1856; Olmsted, *A Journey Through Texas,* 503-504.

[5] Letter of Postmaster Graves of Hallettsville, November 9, 1856, to the Galveston *Civilian,* reprinted in Lexington (Kentucky) *Observer and Reporter,* November 26, 1856.

[6] Maysville (Kentucky) *Eagle,* December 13, 1856.

tion there had been exaggerated. Investigation had shown no evidence of an actual plot.[7] This denial, repeated in many newspapers, preceded any actual news of difficulties in the locality.

The Texas incidents were but a prelude to the more serious slave plots which soon broke out in Tennessee and Kentucky, spreading panic into every Southern state. Robert Bunch, British consul at Charleston, reported to his government upon information learned from private sources that Nashville was the center of a projected servile insurrection involving the surrounding states.[8] On October 29 a Negro girl belonging to G. W. Vandel, an engineer of Fayette County, Tennessee, revealed a plot set for the day of the presidential election when all the able-bodied white men would be away at the polls. After murdering and plundering the remaining citizens the slaves planned to go to Memphis where friends awaited them with arms. They then expected to escape to the free states. Vandel and his wife quickly confirmed this story by eavesdropping upon the slave cabins at night. Next day he had thirty-two slaves arrested and sufficient evidence adduced to commit twenty-three to jail at Somerville. A vigilance committee was hastily formed as the community became aroused. One member wrote to the Memphis *Enquirer:*

> Facts were brought to light sufficient to satisfy all present, not only of the guilty intentions of some six or eight of the Negroes arrested, but it was made clear to the minds of thinking men present, that the thing was not confined to this particular neighborhood, but that they expected to act in concert with various others in the surrounding counties and States.[9]

A week later further excitement broke out when twenty-four guns and two kegs of powder were discovered in the possession of slaves at Columbia, Maury County. Similar reports of slave plots came from Frank-

[7] *Ibid.,* December 18, 1856. For similar evidences of unrest in Louisiana and Texas, see James Stirling, *Letters from the Slave States* (London, 1857), 300.

[8] Laura A. White, "The South in the 1850's as Seen by British Consuls," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), I (1935), 29-48.

[9] Letter of W. E. Eppes of Fayette County to Col. J. P. Pryor, November 2, 1856, in Boston *Liberator,* November 28, 1856.

lin County. A panic in Perry County resulted in the killing of ten or twelve Negroes by their owners.[10]

Perhaps the most terror-stricken community of the entire South in 1856 comprised Stewart and Montgomery counties, Tennessee, on the western border of Kentucky. Although the combined slave population appeared to be 12,000 while the whites were at least 19,000, at many points the Negroes outnumbered the rest of the community. In the iron district on the Cumberland and Tennessee rivers there were eight to ten thousand slaves employed at the various iron works making charcoal, aiding in mining operations, and tending furnaces under the supervision of a few white overseers. Many of the plants were within several miles of each other, some in sections containing few white inhabitants. In the neighborhood of Louisa Furnace, Montgomery County, a keg of gun powder was found beneath a church. A large collection of arms and ammunition had also been discovered and seized. On the morning of November 21, a Negro, Britton, belonging to S. D. Raimey, was heard arousing the slaves, presumably for an outbreak, but his actual words appeared to have been unintelligible. When Britton resisted an overseer's order to halt he was instantly shot.[11] A white man, who was alleged to have been counseling insurrection at the time of his capture, was imprisoned. The slaves, organized as "generals" and "captains," had, according to their confessions, planned an uprising for Christmas day. They were to march on Clarksville, the county seat, capture the town, plunder its banks, and then flee to the North.[12] A citizen wrote that "The plot is deep laid and embraces the slaves throughout a wide extent of territory, ranging from Kentucky South and West."[13] At Clarksville a strong special patrol was on duty every night; it was reported that every housekeeper was prepared with arms for any emergency. By December 11 the Nashville *Union and American* observed:

[10] Louisville *Journal,* November 9, 1856, quoted in Boston *Liberator,* December 12, 1856; also in Baltimore *Sun,* December 11, 1856.

[11] New York *Herald,* December 12, 1856.

[12] Nashville *Banner,* November 27, 1856, quoted in Boston *Liberator,* December 12, 1856; Maysville *Eagle,* December 6, 1856.

[13] Maysville *Eagle,* December 6, 1856.

"Quite a panic has existed in parts of the State during the last two weeks growing out of some discovered plots for insurrection among the slaves. . . . Let the people of the South watch bad white men who come among us in sheep's clothing."[14] The city council of Clarksville notified the ironmasters and other owners of slaves on December 17 that no visiting slave would be permitted to remain in the town for more than two hours unless accompanied by some "responsible white person" on penalty of twenty lashes.[15] Slaves having their master's written permission were exempted. Other stringent rules designed to regulate the holiday activities of the Negro were laid down to avoid contacts of other slaves with those of Clarksville.

At Dover, chief town in adjacent Stewart County, an intense feeling of panic over reports of slave plots developed during the first week of November. The editor of the *Courrier des Etats Unis,* visiting this area on December 2, found the entire white population including the children armed and organized for defense. A Negro, who had escaped from the Cumberland Iron Works to avoid taking part in a conspiracy, made such revelations as to cause the arrest of nearly eighty slaves, "almost all of whom avowed their complicity in the plot and even gave the most precise details as to the execution of their project."[16] Three whites, former members of the Free Soil party, were arrested on a charge of inciting a riot, then beaten, and driven out of the state; and a Negro abolitionist preacher was arrested. The plot, which had been set for Christmas day, was believed to have contemplated a general massacre of whites, the capture of Dover, and escape to the North. As new confessions were wrung from the slaves, the panic spread from the Cumberland River to the Memphis region. Nineteen Negroes were eventually hanged at Dover.[17] The jails in many of the counties were crowded with suspects and the county courts in each district were quickly assembled

[14] Quoted in New York *Tribune,* December 20, 1856.

[15] Baltimore *Sun,* December 18, 1856.

[16] Quoted in *ibid.,* December 13, 1856.

[17] Evansville (Indiana) *Journal,* December 9, 1856, quoted in Boston *Liberator,* December 26, 1856; Baltimore *Sun,* December 15, 1856. A white man, one Hurd, suspected of inciting slaves to rebellion, was captured in Memphis, taken across to Arkansas, and given a thousand lashes. Maysville *Eagle,* January 8, 1857.

to hear the terror-stricken prisoners. Vigilance committees and patrols were appointed for each neighborhood and township. Women and children emigrated to more populous districts. The atmosphere was ripe for the most exaggerated claims of slave uprisings. Sixty slaves belonging to Senator John Bell, then absent from the state, and employed in the Cumberland Iron Works were alleged to have been implicated; nine of these were hanged, four by court process and five by a mob. Bell, reputed to have been a kind master, lost some ten thousand dollars of slave property by the insurrection panic.[18] Twenty-five iron furnaces ceased operations due to the common paralysis. During the prolonged excitement which lasted until January no actual slave outbreak occurred.[19]

On December 10 the Nashville city council increased the slave patrol for day and night duty. Negro schools and Negro preachings were forbidden; all assemblages of Negroes after sundown were likewise prohibited. Free Negroes coming in from other counties and free resident Negroes, "if found in suspicious circumstances," were to be arrested.[20] Nashville experienced many wild rumors regarding anticipated uprisings but investigating committees were unable to discover any definite evidence of such plots. In neighboring Gallatin County, a citizen wrote, "Our town has presented one continuous scene of excitement during the past week."[21] Investigation, he claimed, established the fact of a plot

[18] Dispatch, dated December 16, in New York *Tribune,* December 20, 1856. The *Tribune's* correspondent reported: "The insurrectionary movement in Tennessee obtained more headway than is known to the public—important facts being suppressed in order to check the spread of the contagion." *Ibid.;* Baltimore *Sun,* December 24, 1856.

[19] According to the informants of the New York *Tribune,* the confessions appeared spurious. Actually, a story had been circulated among the slaves "that Col. Fremont with a numerous force to back him, was waiting at the bottom of the Cumberland River for Christmas night to come, when he and his army were to emerge from the river to aid in the deliverance of the slaves. The fact that he was there was proved by the sudden rise in the river, which was insisted upon as being caused by the great number of men and boats collected at the bottom. Believing that Fremont's powder would be dampened, the Blacks attempted to buy up a store of it for him. . . . It does not appear that they expected to do anything for themselves." *Ibid.,* December 20, 1856.

[20] Baltimore *Sun,* December 13, 1856; Boston *Liberator,* December 19, 1856; Maysville *Eagle,* January 8, 1857. The Louisville *Democrat* reported that there was a movement on foot in Tennessee to banish free Negroes beyond the border of the state. Lexington *Observer and Reporter,* January 7, 1857.

[21] Lexington *Observer and Reporter,* December 20, 1856; Baltimore *Sun,* December 18, 1856.

but the extent of organization was not yet determined. Twenty-five to thirty Negroes were arrested and brought before a vigilance committee. The Nashville *Union and American,* accounting for the increasing rumors of slave unrest, commented:

> The recent Presidential canvass has had a deleterious effect on the slave population. The negroes manifested an unusual interest in the result, and attended the political meetings of the whites in large numbers. This is dangerous. The necessity for watchfulness is very great. The slaveholders must anxiously guard, both against the attacks of Northern fanatics, and the insidious wiles of enemies at home.[22]

The Memphis *Visitor* editorialized in similar vein at the beginning of the panic:

> The excitement in reference to the recent reports in regard to a probable servile insurrection is probably greater than is justified by the real state of the case. . . . We have heard [during the political campaign] speakers of both parties use language . . . calculated to inspire *the hope among dissatisfied slaves that with an effort on their own part, they would be free* in the event of the success of the most abused candidate; and *we have seen crowds of negroes at the out-skirts of political assemblages in this city, listening attentively to the efforts of restless demagogues to prove* that the prospects were very fair for the election of Fremont. Was it not supposed that the negroes would take these things home and talk over them with other slaves? . . . If this eternal agitation of the slavery question does not cease we may expect servile insurrections in dead earnest.[23]

The panic spirit soon penetrated across the Kentucky border. A vigilance committee of Lafayette, Christian County, in that state addressed an appeal for military aid to the "Gentlemen of Hopkinsville." "From reliable information we expect an attack from the negroes of the Iron Works on our town tomorrow morning, perhaps tonight. Please come to our assistance."[24] The secretary of the committee appended this information:

> The negroes of Eclipse, Clark, and Lagrange have united and are marching towards Dover and were within eight miles of that place when last heard from.

[22] Quoted in Boston *Liberator,* December 12, 1856.

[23] *Ibid.* The editorial continued: "A lady a few days ago went into her kitchen and gave some directions to the negro cook, who replied with a sneer, 'When Fremont's elected, you'll have to sling them pots yourself.' Now, was not this negro led to believe that Fremont would be elected, by some alarmist on the stump?"

[24] Lexington *Observer and Reporter,* December 10, 1856.

Their intention is to relieve the negroes at Dover, then march to the Rolling Mill, then to the Bellwood Furnace, then through Lafayette on to Hopkinsville and the Ohio River.[25]

At Hopkinsville the correspondent of the Louisville *Courier* heard one phrase on all lips, "The negroes are marching on us!" He noted that the telegraph poles were cut down and communication broken off. About one hundred and fifty armed men left for Lafayette under the command of Captain James Jackson and Sheriff Gowen.[26]

During the first week of December rumors of slave plots spread into Henderson County on the Ohio River where it was believed that the holidays would unloose open revolt upon the whites.[27] Another Christmas plot was disclosed by a Negro boy in Campbellsville, Taylor County, where considerable dissatisfaction had existed among the slaves.[28] Four or five Negroes were arrested and a night patrol organized. At Cadiz, Trigg County, it was alleged that another center of a slave plot had been discovered. A free Negro preacher, Solomon Young, declared to be the "generalissimo" of the plotters and a notorious character, was hanged on December 19. The responsibility for the plot was attributed to "loco-foco" orators and newspapers. As excitement blazed, a vigilance committee began wholesale arrests of suspects and a special court session was set for Christmas day.[29] Similar excitement was experienced near Russellville, Logan County, where a Negro, employed in one of the iron works across the border in Tennessee, was whipped to death after remarking that he knew all about the plot but would not tell.[30] Even in

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] *Ibid.* A citizen at Pembroke, Christian County, wrote that Bob Murrell, a Negro at the central mill, had been whipped to death for his part in a plot. He added his forebodings: "I have no doubt but that [the plot] is a universal thing all over the Southern States and that every negro, fifteen years old, either knows of it or is into it; and that the most confidential house servants are the ones to be the most active in the destruction of their own families." Canton (Kentucky) *Dispatch,* December 13, 1856, quoted in Boston *Liberator,* January 16, 1857.

[27] Lexington *Observer and Reporter,* December 10, 1856.

[28] Louisville *Journal,* December 17, 1856, quoted in Baltimore *Sun,* December 19, 1856; Lexington *Observer and Reporter,* December 20, 1856.

[29] Lexington *Observer and Reporter,* December 27, 1856; Baltimore *Sun,* December 20, 1856.

[30] Russellville (Kentucky) *Herald,* December 20, 1856, quoted in Baltimore *Sun,* December 22, 1856; Boston *Liberator,* January 2, 1857.

Carter County, at the extreme northeastern part of Kentucky, alleged slave plotters were being discovered and subjected to severe whippings.[31] At Carrollton, Carroll County, some fifty miles northeast of Louisville on the Ohio River, considerable furor was aroused over the alleged slave plots engineered by the Reverend William Anderson, a colored Methodist preacher, who was also accused of aiding fugitive slaves to escape to the North. After a reward of $600 had been offered for his apprehension, he was captured with documents in his possession implicating "distinguished Northerners." His examination, however, proved disappointingly innocuous and he was discharged.[32] Another exciting Christmas plot involving some two hundred Negroes was discovered in Wyoming, Bath County, in the extreme northeastern portion of Kentucky. Forty Negroes, fully armed, were arrested at a colored festival. Their plan was to assemble all the slaves at White Oak Creek and then to cut their way to Ohio. [33] It was estimated that at least ten or twelve alleged leaders of insurrections had been hanged in six counties of Kentucky and that many more awaiting trial might ultimately share their fate.[34] The Lexington *Observer and Reporter,* a Fillmore organ of the American party, noted closely the panic spirit in Kentucky and elsewhere:

> From every quarter of the South we hear of insurrections and rumors of insurrections among the slaves. . . . During the Presidential contest the Democratic party was constantly crying out that Fremont would be elected, and the institution of slavery be overthrown, unless the American party of the South came to their rescue. In this city . . . negroes stood in swarms about the Court House Yard. They heard it proclaimed [by the Democrats] that the Know-Nothing party were aiding Fremont in voting for Fillmore, and that they were his secret friends.[35]

From Tennessee and Kentucky the contagion of fear swept across the Mississippi River into Missouri and Arkansas. Insurrectionary move-

[31] This refers to the plot involving the slaves of William McMinnis, a large planter of Carter County. Boston *Liberator,* January 23, 1857.

[32] Baltimore *Sun,* December 17, 22, 1856.

[33] Mount Sterling (Kentucky) *Whig,* December 26, 1856, quoted in Maysville *Eagle,* December 27, 1856.

[34] Maysville *Eagle,* January 6, 1857. The Mayor of Louisville issued a proclamation that "all slaves will be imprisoned who are found from home after 8 o'clock at night during the holidays." Baltimore *Sun,* December 25, 1856.

[35] Lexington *Observer and Reporter,* December 20, 1856.

ments, originating in Obion County, Tennessee, and Fulton County, Kentucky, were traced to New Madrid and Scott counties in Missouri. Information was received that the slaves of the four counties were planning an uprising for Christmas day. A meeting of anxious citizens was held at New Madrid on December 15 to discuss the situation. After listening to evidence obtained from "the ringleaders and instigators" of the plot, the group appointed vigilance committees to carry out a series of resolutions: Negro meetings were banned and colored ministers forbidden to preach; slaves might not attend public meetings unless accompanied by a master or his agent; the system of "passes" for slaves was carefully circumscribed in application; and missionary efforts among them were to be discontinued.[36] The *Missouri Democrat* of December 4, commenting on the "numberless alarms respecting contemplated risings in the South," stated, "This is assuredly a most lamentable condition for the Slave States for nothing causes such terror upon the plantations as the bare suspicion of these insurrections."[37]

In Arkansas the most specific reports of slave plots came from Union County on the Louisiana border and the eastern county of St. Francis. The conspiracy in Union County was declared to be led by an abolitionist, one Hancock, and several others who were organizing three hundred Negroes for an attack to be made on November 14 at the county seat, El Dorado. After a successful massacre and plunder of the town's inhabitants, the assailants expected to reach Kansas. Although Hancock was immediately captured he proved to be innocent, but admitted knowledge of the particulars of the plot. After his acquittal, he was seized by a mob, taken to the woods, and shot. Another alleged leader, a certain Martin, was declared guilty by the El Dorado court and hanged.[38] A similar panic shook adjacent Ashley County. In St. Francis County a slave revealed a plot set for Christmas day when a band would burn

[36] New Madrid (Missouri) *Times,* quoted in Baltimore *Sun,* November 25, 1856; Boston *Liberator,* December 12, 1856.

[37] Quoted in *Annual Reports of the American Anti-Slavery Society, 1857-1858* (New York, 1859), 78.

[38] Lexington *Observer and Reporter,* October 29, 1856; Boston *Liberator,* December 12, 1856.

Madison and other nearby towns. Three Negroes broke down under a whipping by the local vigilance committee to confess that they were involved.[39] Subsequently, a proposal was made before the Arkansas legislature that all free Negroes be removed from the state, but the measure was defeated.[40]

The Hancock affair of Union County, Arkansas, was presumed to be directly related to plots in northern Louisiana. Amidst the growing panic in that section, planters investigated supposed plots among their slaves but were unable to discover any substance to these fears. In the delta region, however, serious plots were reported, particularly in the parishes of St. Martin, Assumption, and St. Mary. The town of St. Martinville, St. Martin Parish, "was thrown into great commotion" on November 18 by Negro confessions regarding an insurrection planned for Christmas day. The ringleaders, alleged to have been favorite family servants, were imprisoned.[41] At Napoleonville, Assumption Parish, a Negro boy, John, belonging to the planter, F. Robichaux, was punished for his part in a proposed uprising by two months imprisonment, 350 lashes, and the requirement that he wear irons for the ensuing two years.[42] Three white men were imprisoned in St. Mary Parish as ringleaders of a slave plot; Negroes, previously arrested on these charges, were released, with the exception of a free Negro.[43] More alarming news came from the Louisiana correspondent of the New York *Tribune* on December 31: "I have reliable information from New Orleans that within a few days there have been serious troubles among the slaves in Louisiana; and that as many as twenty negroes have been hung; but the newspapers carefully refrain from any mention of the facts." In several Louisiana parishes public meetings were held for the purpose of common consultation regarding precautionary measures. The sale of liquor to slaves was denounced as *prima facie* evidence of seditious in-

[39] Memphis *Appeal,* December 30, 1856, quoted in Lexington *Observer and Reporter,* January 7, 1857; Maysville *Eagle,* January 8, 1857.

[40] Lexington *Observer and Reporter,* January 14, 1857.

[41] Baltimore *Sun,* December 4, 1856; Lexington *Observer and Reporter,* December 13, 1856; Maysville *Eagle,* December 2, 1856.

[42] Lexington *Observer and Reporter,* January 7, 1857.

[43] Maysville *Eagle,* December 13, 1856.

tentions.[44] When the long-dreaded holidays passed without an outbreak the planters were visibly relieved. The New Orleans *Picayune* of January 2 remarked confidently:

> The holidays have come and passed, and we hear no where of the disturbances among the negro population which, according to rumor, were threatened as likely to take place generally in the South about Christmas. . . . There was never any fear of a concerted attempt to rise, or a general insubordination, nor was full credit given to the details which the telegraph brought us from time to time of alleged attempts at insurrection in various places.[45]

Nevertheless, the editor pointed out that the recent presidential election had been so managed as to awaken hopes of emancipation among the slaves and to encourage the efforts of traveling abolitionists.

None of the Gulf states seemed to have escaped the common panic. In Jackson, Mississippi, the community was aroused on December 21 by confessions of a projected slave uprising and twenty-seven Negroes were jailed. The Mayor called upon all citizens to organize for defense.[46] Subsequent newspaper reports ridiculed the rumors of insurrection as "utterly without foundation."[47] Similar fears, probably unfounded, were experienced in Canton, Mississippi. Within Alabama plots were discovered in Sumter, Marion, and Perry counties; one hundred slaves in all were imprisoned and a white man also appeared to be involved.[48] A sensational report that "a bloody conspiracy is now ripening with a certain class of the population" and set for Christmas day came from Quincy, Gadsden County, Florida, on the southern border of Georgia. The editor of the Jacksonville *Floridian and Journal* suggested on December 6 that the citizens of the state organize an adequate slave patrol ready for any emergency.[49] In Georgia the Athens *Southern Watchman*

[44] Boston *Liberator,* December 12, 1856. A slave uprising was reported in New Iberia Parish, Louisiana, during August, 1856. Helen T. Catterall (ed.), *Judicial Cases concerning American Slavery and the Negro,* 5 vols. (Washington, 1926-1937), III, 648.

[45] This item, with minor errors, was quoted in Boston *Liberator,* January 23, 1857.

[46] Baltimore *Sun,* December 29, 1856. A Northern visitor to the Vicksburg area in Mississippi on Christmas day, 1857, experienced the tense excitement of a rumored slave outbreak. A. De Puy Van Buren, *Jottings of a Year's Sojourn in the South* (Battle Creek, Mich., 1859), 121-22.

[47] Maysville *Eagle,* January 8, 1857.

[48] Lexington *Observer and Reporter,* January 7, 1857.

[49] Quoted in New York *Tribune,* December 20, 1856.

of January 1, 1857, noted that "our citizens have generally recovered from the 'fright' into which some of them were thrown by the report that an attempt at insurrection was to be made by the negroes throughout the South during the Christmas holidays." The editor demanded that the legislature of Georgia "abate this nuisance" of free Negroes whose residence, he declared, "was incompatible with the public safety."[50]

Maryland shared the nightmare of revolt with her sister states. During the middle of December slave confessions were elicited regarding a Christmas plot in certain parts of Prince George County. To meet this threat public meetings were held for defense measures.[51] About the same time excitement broke out in Charles County after the arrest of two Negroes alleged to have planned insurrection. Two white men, suspected as promoters of the plot, fled from the state before they were apprehended.[52] Elsewhere in Maryland there were reports of the formation of new slave patrols and renewed vigilance exercised over the movements of the colored population.[53] The Baltimore *American* remarked: "The recent frequency of rumors in regard to slave insurrections has not failed to attract attention. . . . Their coincidence . . . with the late election-agitation is not without matter for grave consideration. . . . The happenings of several of these alarms at widely different points within a short interval is ominous."[54]

With the extension of the panic to Virginia, the insurrection wave completed a full cycle within the Southern states. A plot was discovered at Williamsburg during the early part of December which had originated among a group of discontented slaves. The usual arrests followed and the community once more settled down. A similar story came from Montgomery County.[55] In New Kent County a slave named Beverly,

[50] Ulrich B. Phillips (ed.), *Plantation and Frontier,* in John R. Commons *et al* (eds.), *A Documentary History of American Industrial Society,* I, II (Cleveland, 1910), II, 116.

[51] Baltimore *Sun,* December 27, 1856.

[52] New York *Herald,* December 6, 1856. Charles County, Maryland, had already experienced the panic of insurrection plots in 1845. Jeffrey R. Brackett, *The Negro in Maryland* (Baltimore, 1889), 96.

[53] Baltimore *Sun,* December 13, 1856.

[54] Quoted in Lexington *Observer and Reporter,* December 17, 1856.

[55] Baltimore *Sun,* December 13, 1856.

belonging to Sarah Crump, was declared guilty of inciting an insurrection and condemned to be hanged.[56] In Millwood, Clark County, confessions established a plot of free Negroes and slaves which involved Harper's Ferry—an interesting forerunner of John Brown's historic deed. These Negroes told the court that "they had heard white men and negroes talking [that] if Fremont was elected they would be free, and as they knew he was not, they were prepared to fight for it."[57] The citizens of Alexandria and other parts of Fairfax County seemed to have had an exceptionally severe fright over alleged slave plots. Students of the theological seminary formed a special patrol. The Mayor of Alexandria forbade all Negro meetings and strengthened the pass system. State forces sent by Governor Henry Wise arrested forty Negroes at a festival which subsequently proved to be an innocent affair.[58] The Governor received numerous reports of insurrections contemplated for Christmas day and sent arms upon request to the counties of Fauquier, King and Queen, Culpeper, Rappahannock, and the towns of Lynchburg, Petersburg, and Gordonsville.[59] During the Christmas holidays when many waited for the lightning to strike, citizens of Louisa, Spotsylvania, and Orange counties met to organize a committee to whip and drive off all gypsies, peddlers, sellers of spirits to slaves, and all suspicious itinerants in that section of the country.[60] The Richmond *Examiner* of January 23 published a widely-quoted editorial demanding that the free Negroes of the South be either exiled or enslaved on the ground that they were a constant danger in organizing insurrections and setting a bad example of freedom before dissatisfied slaves.[61] The Richmond *Enquirer,* commenting on the symmetry of the Southern slave plots, made this warning statement: "These are not the wild and visionary projects with which negroes may be disposed to amuse themselves in the most

[56] Fredericksburg (Virginia) *News,* January 15, 1857. This newspaper showed extreme reticence in reporting the panic, confining major items to half-inch notices.

[57] Baltimore *Sun,* December 27, 1856.

[58] *Ibid.,* December 16, 1856; *Virginia Traveller,* December 15, 1856, quoted in Boston *Liberator,* December 19, 1856.

[59] H. W. Flournoy (ed.), *Calendar of Virginia State Papers, 1836-1869* (Richmond, 1893), XI, 50.

[60] Fredericksburg *News,* January 26, 1857.

[61] Quoted in Boston *Liberator,* February 27, 1857.

quiet communities but the maturely prepared, and, in some instances, the partially executed plans of a deliberate and widespread purpose of revolt."[62]

At the North many of the abolitionists chose this opportunity to renew their attacks on the slaveholders. The New York *Herald,* professing sorrow over the insurrection panic, complained, "It is painful to see the apparent gusto with which our nigger-worshipping contemporary of the *Tribune* gloats over the news of projected Southern servile insurrections."[63] The editor also expressed his disdain for Thurlow Weed of the Albany (New York) *Journal* who, he said, "rubs his hands together with something of a chuckle of satisfaction." The *Herald* attributed the plots to the universal notion, propagated by agitators, that Frémont's election would mean the emancipation of the slaves who would then be turned loose on the South to provoke civil war. The New York *Tribune* thundered, "Let the South with her growing insurrections look to it. . . . These last suppressed insurrections grew out of the discussions on Kansas. . . . The manacles of the slave must be stricken off."[64] Extremists like A. J. Grover of Illinois proposed that the Garrison group aid all efforts at insurrection on the ground that "revolution is the only hope of the slave; consequently the quicker it comes, the better."[65] A resolution attributed to Frederick Douglass, the famous ex-slave, then editor of a Frémont paper, read, "Resolved, that while we deeply oppose the necessity of shedding human blood . . . we should rejoice in a successful slave insurrection which would teach slaveholders the wrong and danger involved in the act of slaveholding."[66] Abroad, the Manchester *Guardian* commented on the plight of the South:

> We venture to assert that in consequence [of the slavery agitation] more slaves

[62] Quoted in *Annual Reports of the American Anti-Slavery Society, 1857-1858,* p. 77; Caleb P. Patterson, *The Negro in Tennessee,* University of Texas *Bulletin* No. 225 (Austin, 1922), 49. In York District, South Carolina, powder and muskets were found in the possession of the slaves. The community was reported to be arming. Maysville *Eagle,* January 6, 1857.

[63] New York *Herald,* December 11, 1856.

[64] New York *Tribune,* December 13, 1856.

[65] A. J. Grover to William L. Garrison, February 24, 1857, in Boston *Liberator,* March 13, 1857.

[66] Maysville *Eagle,* November 1, 1856.

have been induced to escape from their masters, more desperate resolutions have been put into their heads, and more general insecurity entailed upon that species of property within the past year than during any five years preceding. . . .[67]

Any evaluation of the sensational events of 1856 must observe certain fundamental cautions. Slave confessions made under duress can scarcely meet the test of complete trustworthiness. Although the thesis of an all-embracing slave plot in the South shows remarkable cohesion on the whole as far as geographic and chronological circumstances are concerned, much can be explained away by a counter-thesis of a panic contagion originating in the unusual political setting of the year. It seems probable, however, that a large number of actual slave plots did exist in 1856. The situation in Kentucky and Tennessee particularly seemed to involve authenticated stories of proposed insurrections. It is also apparent from the news items and editorials of the contemporary press that the year 1856 was exceptional for the large crop of individual slave crimes reported, especially those directed against the life of the master. This fact would suggest a fair amount of reality behind the accounts of slave discontent and plotting. The deep-seated feeling of insecurity characterizing the slaveholder's society evoked such mob reactions as those noted in the accounts of insurrections, imaginary and otherwise, upon any suspicion of Negro insubordination. The South, attributing the slave plots to the inspiration of Northern abolitionists, found an additional reason for the desirability of secession; while the abolitionist element of the North, crediting in full the reports of slave outbreaks, was more convinced than ever that the institution of slavery represented a moral leprosy.

[67] New York *Herald,* January 10, 1857.

Notes and Documents

Slater Fund Beginnings: Letters from General Agent Atticus G. Haygood to Rutherford B. Hayes

Edited by Curtis W. Garrison

"Mr. Hayes, I am not accustomed, although a preacher—to speak of my faith & religious convictions—this, once: I believe with all my soul that God's hand is on me for these poor people. It is to me a sacred work. It is the prayer of my days & nights—that I may be faithful. It is now getting late & my light is not good & I must stop."

The above passage from a letter written by Dr. Atticus G. Haygood, January 12, 1887, can serve as a text to his eight years of work as General Agent for the Trustees of the John F. Slater Fund in carrying education to the Negroes of the South. When the Trustees found him in October, 1882, he was president of Emory College, a Methodist institution at Oxford, Georgia. On assuming full-time duties for the Trustees in January, 1885, he was made "Professor Emeritus of Evidences of Christianity" in this college in order to retain his connection with the Methodist Conference. He resigned the Slater Fund work in April of 1891 to accept the appointment of bishop in his church.[1]

President Hayes was first drawn into the work upon election as a Trustee of the Peabody Education Fund, October 4, 1877. This was in honor of his Southern policy,[2] but Hayes had also advocated Federal aid to education in the South in his inaugural address. It was reiterated in

[1] See article on Haygood by E. H. Johnson, in *Dictionary of American Biography,* 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), VIII, 452-53. This article merely mentions the Slater Fund work, however.

[2] *Proceedings of the Trustees of the Peabody Education Fund, 1874-1881* (Boston, 1881), II, 138-39.

his annual messages of 1877, 1878, and especially in that of 1880. On his invitation the Peabody Trustees met at the White House for their 1880 annual meeting. On February 19, the second day, a report was presented at the Riggs House meeting by a special committee, of which Alexander Hugh Holmes Stuart of Virginia was chairman, entitled "Education for the Colored Population of the United States." A memorial was then sent to Congress advocating specific Federal aid.[3] Hayes was an admirer of Stuart because of his Whiggish antecedents.[4] Several of his friends were Peabody Trustees, including Secretary of State William M. Evarts and Chief Justice Morrison R. Waite. J. L. M. Curry, the General Agent, was an old classmate in the Harvard Law School. On October 6 of the year Hayes left the White House, the Chief Justice, vacationing at Norwich, Connecticut, the home of John F. Slater, sent the former President a letter introducing Rev. Leonard W. Bacon, "who wishes to consult you with reference to a subject nearly allied to that of the Peabody Trust."[5] The upshot of this and succeeding conferences was the organization of the "John F. Slater Fund for the Education of Freedmen." The founder's letter to the Trustees is dated March 4, 1882; the incorporation charter was approved April 28, and the first Trustees meeting occurred May 18 of the same year.[6]

Haygood's appointment as General Agent can not be pinned definitely to any person, but evidences[7] in the Hayes Papers from which the following letters are selected would indicate that Bacon, pastor of the church which Slater attended, had proposed him both to President Hayes and Slater. In the President's library is a copy of Haygood's book, *Our*

[3] *Ibid.*, 256, 265-99.

[4] Charles R. Williams (ed.), *Diary and Letters of Rutherford Birchard Hayes,* 5 vols. (Columbus, 1922-1926), III, 501, 513. Also, a marginal note by Hayes on a letter from Alexander H. H. Stuart, December 20, 1877, R. B. Hayes Papers (The Hayes Memorial, Fremont, Ohio).

[5] R. B. Hayes Papers.

[6] The documents referred to were printed in a separate pamphlet, *Organization of the Trustees of the John F. Slater Fund* (Baltimore, 1882); and also in the *Proceedings of the Trustees of the John F. Slater Fund, for the Education of Freedmen, 1883* (Baltimore, 1883). On organization, see L. W. Bacon Letters, R. B. Hayes Papers.

[7] Bacon to Hayes, December 26, 1881; and March 27, May 5, September 8, 17, 29, 1881, R. B. Hayes Papers.

Brother in Black (New York and Cincinnati, 1881), presented to him by Bacon. Hayes often quoted the title admiringly in his letters. This pioneer expression of a soul unbigoted and unafraid, who knew the Negro and knew the South, would naturally give him commanding prominence with Northern philanthropists.

Atticus G. Haygood was a good choice. The task was mightier than these men dreamed, and any scientific centimeter measure at the outset would soon have proclaimed failure. He carried Slater's faith into the field, and his whirlwind methods sowed the seed. His controversies with President Daniel C. Gilman of Johns Hopkins, secretary, and Morris K. Jesup, treasurer, are most enlightening, showing his methods and his problems. Hayes gave constant encouragement, but at the same time respected the academic statesmanship and practical educational ideas of Gilman, especially his interest in manual training. Haygood's weakness was in diffusing the appropriations, so that driblets were lost on poor institutions. The *Proceedings* of the Trustees indicate their awareness of this, and resolutions to make a general study of the whole problem, and of concentrating on several good schools were passed, without measurably affecting the situation. These adjustments had to wait until Dr. Curry succeeded Haygood in 1891, and managed both the Peabody and Slater funds together.

The story of this work has yet to be evalued. The Peabody work was better grounded by Dr. Barnas Sears, no doubt, and produced an effect ten times its financial value on the public school system of the South. The Slater funds were distributed to twenty-five or thirty-five schools and colleges, especially those emphasizing manual and industrial training. These drops must have permeated below the strata and the missionary work of Haygood must have been a forerunner to later foundation work. The agrarian and Populist revolts and the disfranchisement of the blacks in the 1890's robbed the Slater Fund of its fundamental tenet, "Universal Suffrage, Universal Education." That generation's naïve faith in education steadily declined. The practical and intellectual betterment of a few Negroes out of the great mass of increasing population

with increasing illiteracy, was all that remained. This challenge and the answers came with a later era.

Emory College,
Oxford, Georgia,
Dec. 6, 1882

My dear Mr. Hayes:

I inclose my first report.[8] It was not sent Dec. 1 because I was from home attending the North Georgia Conference of which I am a member.

I can tell you good news. The Southern Methodist Church last May, at the General Conference passed a resolution looking to the establishment of a high-grade school for colored people.[9] That was a great joy to me for I have been battling hard for it and, at first, almost alone.

The Board of Trustees was appointed in due time & the school directed to be located in Augusta, Ga. They were looking about for a suitable man for President. Whereupon Dr. Morgan Callaway (see above)[10] my right-hand man steps forward & proposes to take this negro college in hand, and give his life to it. He could have staid here all his life—being one of the most loved & popular Georgians. But this new work he enters from a profound consideration of duty. It has made simply a tremendous impression upon our people. Dr. Callaway is of a long line of aristocratic slave-owners—is a native of Georgia—was a brave officer in the War & a gallant fighter. He has the *absolute* confidence of our people. Our conference responded with enthusiasm & unanimously pledged cooperation. This is the *first* case of the kind; it will not be the last. It marks the beginning of a new chapter in the history of our Southern Methodism & of our section.

I think that you, as President of the Slater Board, will not censure me when I say that I have used part of the last month in helping Dr. Callaway get his plans perfected. There are nearly one *million* in our church. Dr. C. will challenge their respect. It is going to be more pleasant for Northern people teaching in the South.

Very truly,

A. G. HAYGOOD

Hon. R. B. Hayes

[8] This was a short, general statement of two months' observations, and not printed by the Trustees.

[9] Payne Institute, Augusta, Georgia.

[10] The parenthetical "see above" refers to the letterhead of Emory College where Dr. Callaway is listed as vice-president.

Emory College,
Oxford, Georgia,
Sept. 19, 1883

Dear Mr. Hayes:-

Pardon *this* paper—It is far in the night and I have used up everything in my home office. I should have had my report "in type" in the hands of members of the Board three days ago. My excuse is—I have had the biggest sort of a fight on hand since my return. My Monteagle & Chautauqua speeches[11] raised a tempest. I replied by publishing 40,000 copies—I have said nothing else—wanted them to know that I meant what I said. I have worked from 10 to 15 hours in the twenty-four—directing wrappers & sending off. About 20,000 are distributed now & the rest in process. The trouble was: the papers denounced without publishing and the people got mad about what I did not say. Some of them about what I did say. The results are going to be glorious. More real thought has been bestowed, in these regions, upon the negro and his education & his whole case—in the last month than in the last ten years. I have not heard of *one* Southern paper that has not taken some hand in it. I have applications daily—yesterday for about 2500, a leading N. C. paper sending for 2,000 to send out to subscribers.

Don't let the Board scold me for my delay. The report will be along next week. It is the first time in my life I have not been ready. With best wishes & compliments to Mrs. H. & your family.

I am very truly,
A. G. HAYGOOD

Oxford, Georgia,
Jan'y 14, 1884

My dear Mr. Hayes:

I inclose a letter and ask your advice—that advice I trust. I will promptly give Mr. [Morris K.] Jesup a list of the institutions & send him their reports, etc. The especial points are in the inclosed letter between places marked X - X. How far should I go into *details* of "reasons" with Mr. J.? What supervisory relation has Mr. J. or the Finance Committee to appropriations I make—in so far as the appropriation not contingent made by the Board? As to the $20,000 contingent —that I understand.

I am neither suspicious nor jealous of authority but Mr. J.'s mental processes I have observed to be peculiar. How far it will be useful for me to undertake to

[11] Dr. Haygood spoke at Monteagle, Tennessee, August 2, on "The Education of the Negro," and at Chautauqua, New York, August 17 and 20, on "A Southern Man's Report on the Negro" and "If Universal Suffrage, Then Universal Education." These are printed in his book, *Pleas for Progress* (Nashville, 1889).

put Mr. Jesup in possession of every "reason" influencing my mind as to appropriations—places—amounts—objects, etc. etc. I am in doubt. My decisions grew out of a full year's observation—inspection, travel & correspondence—conference, etc. etc. It is not clear to me that I can cause Mr. J. to understand the *grounds* of decisions, etc. You will confer a very great favor by giving me your views as to the proper thing for me to do. Also—as to what relation of supervision this Finance Committee has to my appropriations, etc.

I was taken sick in Texas & my trip there was broken into—but good was done. For the first time since May 1854 I was flattened out in bed. The doctors said "must" & "must not" to me—Said I was threatened with "compound pneumonia, pleurisy, bronchitis, etc." But I was up after a week and at work & am nearly what I was.

I am satisfied that the work committed to me is in good care. I am not hurrying to get rid of the $20,000. appropriated in Oct. By patient adherence to the plans of the Board I find that all the best schools are coming to see the value of Industrial Training. I am to visit New Orleans in about two weeks to meet the Board of Trustees of the Louisiana State College for colored people. A Southern man—Vanderbilt alumnus was made President last fall & I think it might be well to put money there—if I find upon investigation that they will do right. Other things being equal, I think the State institutions should at least have as much consideration as those supported by societies. It goes far to build up a sentiment among our people that will be strong enough someday to support these schools without aid.

Y'rs very truly,
A. G. HAYGOOD

Hon. R. B. Hayes

Emory College,
Oxford, Georgia,
Dec. 6, 1884

My dear Sir:

Yesterday I mailed to you a copy of the Atlanta Constitution, containing proceedings of the Board of Trustees of Emory College, Nov. 26, in Atlanta, at the session of the North Georgia Conference.

In your letter of Oct. 22 you say: "The Agent of the Peabody Fund is paid $5,000 salary and $1,000. expenses as I now recollect. We are ready to contract with you on the same, or a similar basis."[12]

For simplicity's sake in keeping the accounts and to avoid occasions of difference of opinion with the Treasurer as to what *are* expenses I very much desire

[12] Dr. Haygood arranged to devote all of his time after January 1, 1885. See *Proceedings of the Trustees of the John F. Slater Fund for the Education of Freedmen, 1885* (Baltimore, 1885).

that you instruct him to pay me $500 per month for salary & expenses—without expense items. This will be the same to the Board and it simplifies matters. Out of this $500 I pay all postage, stationery & travelling expense items. The Reports issued by the Board I understand to be the Board's affair, the printed reports I make to the Board is my affair.

The $1000. will hardly cover expenses. I shall be from home most of the time & I pay my hotel bills. I shall not sponge upon people. And I will have to employ a clerk to look after mail, etc. when I am away.

As to my connections here they are of a sort that help my Slater work, they cannot hinder it.

I am elected President of the Board of Trustees of the College—the position held by our late Senior Bishop for twenty years. The Board meets once a year here.

I will be put down in the list of the Faculty as "Professor Emeritus of Evidences of Christianity"—This is purely honorary—just as I am a member of several Historical & other Societies that I never attend. I have no claim on the college & the college has no claim on me—except my friendship & advice & such a help as kind feeling & a little personal influence may bring. I shall deliver occasional lectures on Biblical topics—just as I will do in schools I may visit as Slater Agent. This "Professor Emeritus" position enables me to solve the problem of which I spoke to you—to retain my membership in the Conference and so to keep in line with my church. I found the Bishop much interested in my Slater work & quite willing to appoint me "Professor Emeritus." The discipline of the Church does not allow appointment to the Slater Agency—such a thing not being contemplated by the law makers. But it is understood all around that the Slater Agency is my business.

My successor here is thoroughly fitted for his place. He is an old classmate & will push the college on the lines of progress that I have started.

Now I begin what, if it please God, may take the rest of my active life.

Very truly yours,

ATTICUS G. HAYGOOD

Hon. R. B. Hayes, Fremont, Ohio

Oxford, Georgia,
March 30, 1885

Dear Sir:

Your telegram rec'd. I sent my question that I might make my plan of visitations & know how to answer many invitations. I do not care about a meeting if I can go on with my work. At present I can appropriate nothing—Everything waits the "investigation" so much talked of in January.[13] I want to know before

[13] A committee headed by Daniel C. Gilman was chosen at the January 17, 1885, meeting of the Trustees to investigate the educational needs of the Negro, the various

the vacation season what I can use for the school year 1885-86. The people I deal with will need to know so that they may make their arrangements before they begin again in October.

The report I sent you—prepared for the contemplated meeting last week shows what I think on the general subject of suspending appropriations till more investigations are had. The subject of schooling the negro is one of the least mysterious of Christian duties. Almost daily I have appeals for aid to worthy schools. Every dollar available above running expenses & the $10,000 guarantee fund[14] should be used. I could place $100,000 next year wisely if I had it.

I met Mr. Jesup in Atlanta last week & visited three schools for the colored people. He was amazed & pleased & knows the subject as he knows it. You will understand this sentence. He was exceedingly amiable and good.

The speech I made at Holly Springs[15] will appear this week in N. Y. Chris-[tian] Ad[vocate] & in Southern papers also. A great many in pamphlet are to be furnished me for gratuitous distribution in the South. The errors in my Report are provided for in errata.

Y'rs very truly & Respectfully,

A. G. HAYGOOD

Hon. R. B. Hayes

Oxford, Georgia,
May 4, 1885

My dear Mr. Hayes:

I enclose a letter received Friday last on my return from a visitation in Alabama. I have spent most of the day in answering it—as in courtesy bound. I send it to you that you may understand things. Last February I had a letter from a Johns Hopkins student desiring a sort of appointment from me to *investigate*

agencies at work, and plans to make the fund useful "by its indirect application" as well as its direct application. This statement no doubt had reference to influence on official and public interests in which the Peabody Fund was so successful. The Trustees were to meet again in Atlanta in March, but this was later deemed inadvisable. Instead there was a called meeting in New York in May to which were invited J. L. M. Curry, general agent for the Peabody Fund, and G. J. Orr, superintendent of schools in Georgia. Haygood's report on "The Case of the Negro as to Education in the Southern States," which was to contribute to the Atlanta meeting, was published by him privately; and, the annual meetings being changed to May, there was no general report in 1885. One for 1885-1886 was printed in the *Proceedings* of the following year.

[14] Ten thousand dollars was set aside each year by the Trustees against the impairment of principal. About $40,000 a year was appropriated for the General Agent's allocations.

[15] At the dedication of the "Elizabeth L. Rust Industrial Home," Holly Springs, Mississippi, March 10, 1885. Printed in Haygood, *Pleas for Progress*.

the subject of Negro Education—doubtless it was suggested to him—for Dr. G[ilman] suggested to me that he had a young man apt in such matters.[16]

Now I protest I am moderately patient—but *you* will let me write my mind to *you*. This will, I think, suggest to you to so manage some very excellent people that it may not be necessary to free my mind to them.

1. The undertones of the January meeting were to me utterly unsatisfactory. There seemed to be a notion that the chief end of the Slater Board was to *study* the Negro Question. The Secretary said somewhat about the Royal Commission of Inquiry into all sorts of matters in East India—I know the book. Also the Commission appointed to inquire into Sociology in the West Indies, etc. etc. Books minute & interminable as the Ku Klux books.—Such inquiries are for theorists—scientists—amateurs. But they are as remote from the business of the Slater Board and the thought of the dead Prince who gave the money as building the Bartholdi Monument in New York harbor.

It is preposterous. The work of educating the Negro has been going on for over twenty years by experts. Nothing now being done in the line of good works in the world is better understood & for us to go into prolonged & minute investigations will certainly issue in some disagreeable results. 1. We will be laughed at by people who know about this business. 2. We will be censured for wasting time and money. 3. We will lose the sympathy of the great Societies with whom we must cooperate, if we are to do anything.

I have cut loose from everything but this & what I want is—all the money the Board can use & full opportunity in the field. I claim this—every school I have touched is larger and better than it was—in every one industrial training is begun & thousands of dollars have been raised by others by the stimulus of what we have done. Other schools need and deserve help—but I have been muzzled as to promising anything since January because_____You know the case as well as I.

If this sort of thing keeps on the Board will break me down & disappoint the spirit of the old man who sleeps in Norwich.

I write to *you* all I think—I have learned to trust you perfectly. I write to nobody else this way. I send a sermon I preached to "my boys"—while yet I was with them. Some "rainy day" you may find time to glance over it.

I am arranging to be in New York 3rd week in May!

Y'rs most truly—

A. G. HAYGOOD

Hon. R. B. Hayes, Fremont, Ohio

[16] This letter would indicate that Gilman was the originator of the statement referred to in n. 13. References to "the dead Prince" below are to Slater's death, May, 1884.

Oxford, Georgia,
June 12, 1885

My dear Mr. Hayes:

I send you two papers today—very different. The Charleston paper is the leading democratic paper of Charleston—the N. O. Ad[vocate] our Church organ in New Orleans. Since our meeting in New York, I have sent out drafts for the 4th Quarter for 1884-85. I have spoken at Commencements—to immense crowds in Atlanta, Memphis & Tougaloo, Mississippi. More Southern white people attended than ever before. The Methodist clergy of Memphis were out in force & the lady teachers of the two most fashionable young lady schools in the city. I had, by his request, an hour's interview with Colonel [John M.] Keating, editor of the Memphis Appeal—leading paper there. He told me, in parting, to use his paper as I had need. Just before our N. Y. meeting I made a tour in Alabama. I spoke at Marion to the School there—Many leading white people attended—the local editor taking me to the school in a carriage. The pastor of our church called to express regret that he could not attend. The leading Professors of the Baptist University there called on me & I was urged to deliver an address in the Courthouse to all classes on the subject of Negro Education. Ten days after leaving there the principal of our School wrote me that more Marion people had called to see the school etc. than in all the years he had been there.

You will understand why I mention these things. In addition to my agency work proper, I am seeking to create and foster sentiment in favor of the work of teaching these poor people among Southern white people. I do not believe that I can do anything so important for the Southern negro as this.

I had not opportunity in New York to set forth the absolute necessity of our present plan of diffusion, as against the notion of concentrating on three or four big work-shops, fitted up with machinery—not to be used by many, after leaving such places.[17] There are many objections & insuperable ones obvious to all who really understand the matter. It would arrest whatever sentiment the Slater work is helping—except in the three or four localities that receive money. It would pervert Mr. Slater's gift—his chief idea, as I know, from two long talks with him, was to help to prepare young men & women to teach. We are therefore to help as many as we can provided we help enough to do real good where we help. Tool-craft is most important & our present plan fosters tool-craft—but we dare not, in fidelity to Mr. Slater, so stress this or to overlook and put away what he chiefly cared for.

From what I heard & saw at our meeting I became satisfied that the Slater Board would not adopt the plan proposed by the Treasurer & advocated by the Principals of two schools—obviously to get large money. Such I understand to be your judgment. But if I am mistaken—if it should become the policy of the

[17] Appropriations were going to about twenty-nine institutions ranging in amount from $500 to $2,000.

Board to put all this Slater force into three or four schools for teaching trades—I would like to know in time to know how to adjust my own plans. From many things I have said you understand that an unspeakably broader kind of work is in my mind—was in it when in response to your letter last October I agreed to do what you said—make this my "life work." It is unthinkable that I make the superintending of three or four machine shops my life work—It would destroy the conception with which I cut loose from all else—I have had the tender of the Presidency of two universities within the last three months and my church has work of several sorts that I can get—but *above all things* I prefer what I understood in October I was to do.

I am full of hope & joy—in the full assurance that the cause of Negro education is taking fast hold of the minds & consciences of opinion-makers in the South & I am ready to labor to the end to push this moral reform—for it is a moral reform to come to think right on such a question.

Y'rs truly,

A. G. HAYGOOD

Hon. R. B. Hayes

Oxford, Georgia,
Oct. 12, 1885

Dear Mr. Hayes:

The drafts have been sent out for the 1st ⅓ of the appropriation for school year 1885-86. I trust the Finance Committee can allow the other $5000. by Jan. 1. It will be sorely needed. From that I wish to make an appropriation to the woman's work at Holly Springs, Miss. The outlook for the coming year is good. The schools will be full. The negro fathers are beginning to try to do more themselves. There are signs of a helping spirit among Southern white people that are *buds* of promise. There are many signs of changing sentiment. Two weeks ago I made an address on Temperance in Macon, Georgia where the Bourbon sentiment has been supreme & where for nearly a year the leading daily bombarded me and the cause I plead. It was stated that I had the largest audience ever assembled in the city on such an occasion. Certainly I had a singular introduction. The largest planter perhaps in Southwest Ga.—Col. [Arthur T.?] Fort, presided. He has a small army of negroes in his employment [*sic*]. He said: "I have great pleasure in introducing a man whose wise opinions on grave public questions we have been compelled to accept." The paper had a full report & kind. I am invited to speak on Negro Education in Marion, Ala. right in the edge of the Black Belt, as it is called to white people by white people. Tomorrow I am to speak at the cornerstone laying of an endorsed Academy for white children in an old time Georgia town. And all over the South I have a dozen calls where I can accept one. I write these things to *you* because they indicate chang-

ing sentiment about the *cause* I represent. Paine Institute is going to succeed. A Missouri member of the Methodist Church South offers $25,000. for endowment when the Church furnishes suitable buildings. The Conferences are taking up the proposition & the money is almost certain. This is a "big thing." When my church builds Paine Institute a new chapter is written.

Some fruit appears in our special work.[18] Miss Jones of Ann Arbor, Michigan has completed her course & under high endorsement is ready to begin. I have arranged for her to begin in Atlanta under the wise direction of Miss Packard, Principal of Sherman Institute. The African Methodists have a good school at Salisbury, N. C. Last week, through my agency, a rarely competent colored woman taught in our school in Marion, Ala. entered upon the duty of conducting the Sewing Department in the Salisbury school. I know the woman & have seen her work & at her work. She understands cutting, fitting & all that business: We must look to making them self-supporting in the long run—It may be *very* long, but, sometime, it must be. Apt ones & gifted ones I look out for & place as openings make possible.

I inclose a letter which explains itself. Remember me to Mrs. Hayes whom I hope to meet in Philadelphia.[19]

Y'rs truly & respectfully,

A. G. HAYGOOD

Hon. R. B. Hayes, Fremont, Ohio

[Very few letters are found for 1886, and none of great importance.]

Holly Springs, Miss.,
Jan. 12, 1887

My dear Mr. Hayes:

Last May the Board passed a resolution requesting me to investigate & note the condition & needs of the colored people outside the larger cities etc. etc. to report in writing to the Trustees.

This resolution I have had in view. But my obligations have a broader range than was first suggested to me & a report to be useful must have fuller data & better classification than can be now commanded. Outside the general educational work I am making a specialty of these lines: 1. The colored people & property. 2. Their home life, as marriage & legitimate births may indicate it. I think I will be able by the next meeting to present reports on these lines that will be instructive and useful. Besides personal observation—extended and mi-

[18] Refers to student aid, for which $450 was spent in 1885-1886.

[19] At the annual meeting of the Women's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at which Haygood made a speech, October 23, 1885. Printed in Haygood, *Pleas for Progress*.

nute, I am securing the cooperation of many observers whose views & conclusions will be valuable.

Since the opening of the school year I have been visiting our schools & others—endeavoring in every way possible to me to aid & encourage them. Also, to elicit interest & induce cooperation on the part of Southern white people.

Of the general work I am glad to say & with perfect confidence:

1. With scarcely an exception the Fall openings were most encouraging—nearly all the schools showing increased attendance.

2. The Industrial picture, more & more commands confidence. Those that have it not, want it; those that have it, give it a fairer opportunity. The *uniform* testimony is—it is not only good in itself, but it aids other educational processes.

3. The education of the colored people receives more favorable notice from the Southern press than at any time heretofore.

4. Southern people are *beginning* to aid—in money more than service, but some also in service. Some Southern people of good character & family are teaching in city & state schools. An Emory graduate—a Savannah man of good family, has just taken a place in the Faculty of Paine Institute. The Evangelist Sam. Small, now of the North G[eorgi]a Conf[erence] is its agent. Its former agent, Mr. Dunlap, has been appointed by the Southern Meth[odist] Church to do evangelistic work among colored people in Georgia. The Southern churches are beginning to move. Some work is being done—more is projected.

5. The colored people are themselves doing more for the Education of their children than at any past time.

I write from Holly Springs, being in the midst of a protracted tour through our Southwestern work. I spent yesterday in Little Rock, Arkansas, where the Freedmen's Aid Society has a well-started school. The President thinks he can raise money there from the white people to build a shop—say $300 or $400. I have promised tools & a teacher. Our Le Moyne work in Memphis is doing nobly—they are in their $1,000 building for industrial work, built by Memphis money. Tomorrow morning I address the students of the State Normal school, located here; tomorrow afternoon I formally open a men's industrial department in Rush University—Freedmen's Aid Society. Say to Mrs. Hayes that the Girls' Industrial Home in the University, sustained by her Society, is well reported of—indeed, it is doing admirably.

The Appeal—I sent you a slip from Memphis, says I spent *most* of my time. I spend all—I have no other business. What time I am at home it is desk & office work—all I can stand. More & more I know that I must "work while it is day" to me. I see clearly that I must spread information & seek to develop right thinking among white people in the South. And all the time I am sending out pamphlets & documents & using the press, wherever there is a chance. If I

speak or preach on other occasions than those directly in my agency, I never forget the poor negro. If I say nothing directly there is something I hope will stimulate right views & right doing. If I gain influence I use it for him.

Pardon the weakness—sometimes I am discouraged. (You are the only one to whom I have ever said this—not to my wife.) The main part of my work cannot be reported on or of. I cannot make others see it—I would not care for myself—but I fear they may be discouraged. It is a work that cannot show its results in figures. It seems so slow—but there is no other way. This work must take *root* in the South—& in Southern white consciences—else some day it will die.

Mr. Hayes, I am not accustomed, although a preacher—to speak of my faith & religious convictions—this, once: I believe with all my soul that God's hand is on me for these poor people. It is to me a sacred work. It is the prayer of my days & nights—that I may be faithful. It is now getting late & my light is not good & I must stop.

I preached for the colored people here tonight & had a good meeting. I spoke in Little Rock yesterday—to the Le Moyne School in Memphis on Monday—preached twice in Memphis on Sunday. I do not feel tired—and I am in perfect health.

God bless you & Mrs. Hayes & all yours.

Y'rs. truly ever,

A. G. HAYGOOD

Hon. R. B. Hayes

Oxford, Ga.,
Feb. 3, 1887

My dear Mr. Hayes:

I am just home & find 179 letters to be cared for. Yours is a benediction. I sent a letter to each Trustee & now I find Dr. Gilman has started round the one I wrote him. I did not think it needful to tell him I had written to each. I have this morning explained to him. As to "quarterly reports" I wrote at the end of the 1st school quarter—there was no school report for the vacation. I employed myself as I have always done—using every opportunity to forward the negroes' cause—by speech—travel—correspondence—fact-gathering—circulation of literature, etc.

I earnestly wish to do what I suppose the Board wants. Between us, part of it don't know what it wants. A good many resolutions have been passed—not all in harmony with themselves. And I do the best I can.

One thing I have never done in any work for church or school—General Conference or College Board—kept minute memoranda to show just where I was & what I did day by day. I may say without boasting, hitherto I have had charac-

ter for working—I have had more advice about over-working than anything else. I can't undertake to make reports that are extracts from diaries. My dear friend, I can't work that way. It would freeze up my soul. I believe the best ten days work I ever did for the negro was while on a fishing excursion in 1883. Then & there I made my Monteagle & chautauqua speeches, intending, if I could, to *force* the Southern press to discuss the subject. And I succeeded. But what Trustee will understand me when I report "10 days in the woods." I am too busy now to hope for such a retreat hereafter. My office at home has become the Southern center of correspondence on negro education & its cognate themes. I encourage this & write letters literally by the thousand each year. I must do a great deal of work on indirect lines. I must draw people into the current of interest on these subjects.

Pardon all this. You do understand & it is a help to me [to] write you of my methods.

In my report to the May meeting I will cover fully 1885-86 & 1886-87—except this: the report must be prepared in April. I can't give the itemized expenditures of money by the several schools, for the matter will be in process—not ended. But I can report on the schools & the use of the money: i. e. show how it [is] all to go. Is this what you mean by y'r suggestion of a full report for the year? I could have done that last May for the year then going on, but I had been told to report what had actually been done with the money & that could not (April 1886) be done—two months & more remaining—for some schools there. Do not think I would willingly trouble you—I wish to do just what you think is wise.

I had a good trip—absent 4 weeks—lacking two days. I preached 9 times—made 16 addresses in the time: 6 sermons to white people. These 6 were helpful to the colored cause—I spoke as Slater Agent. We can extend our work wisely—using the whole $40,000 for this year. In Little Rock, Ark. we will place some Slater money. *Our* white people there are going to build a shop—$350 to $400. We can extend in Mississippi—the Baptist School at Jackson (capital) is now ready to work on our lines. And in Louisiana at 2 points: 1. New Orleans. The Freedmen's Aid Society College there is ready now. It has a large patronage & the whole state & part of Mississippi is represented in it. 2. At Baldwyn y'r old friend Gorman. Give him $500. He will do & his school is good & has *roots*—& 1200 acres rich rice & sugar lands. Better work is being done all around. Pardon so much at this time.

Y'rs ever,

A. G. HAYGOOD

Hon. R. B. Hayes

Oxford, Ga.,
Aug. 9, 1887

My dear Friend:

I will write more formally to the other Trustees of the two months succeeding our meeting.

We were at Hampton Thursday, May 19. Friday night I addressed an audience—white & colored at Franklinton, N. C., where one of our schools is located. The subject was—the colored man's education in the John F. Slater Fund plan. The two following days I was in Raleigh. I spoke to a great crowd Saturday night in the Opera House on a local option prohibition issue & improved my opportunity to set before the leading people of Raleigh the importance and value of the right education of the negro race. Sunday A. M. I spoke in the African Methodist church to a large congregation of colored people on the christian education of their people. Sunday at 4 P. M. I had an open air meeting with an audience of 1000 or 1200: subject Temperance, Education & Family government. The following week I spent at home—wrote to our schools what to depend on from us for next school year.

June 1 I delivered the annual Commencement address at Biddle University, Charlotte, N. Carolina. Biddle is Presbyterian & high grade. Till now they have stood out—the only high grade colored school in the South taking their position—against industrial training. I had present the leading men of their Board from Pittsburgh, Pa. I discussed the whole subject in a two hours speech and had the happiness to hear soon after my return to Oxford, that Biddle proposes vigorously to join our column. It is a great victory for sound views on the subject of the education of the colored people.

June 1—(same)—at night I made a local option speech in the Court House in Concord, 20 miles north of Raleigh—white people in front, colored behind. The next night I spoke to a larger crowd, colored people in front & white people behind. In both speeches I brought in and discussed the education of the negro race. In the morning of June 2 I addressed the pupils of Scotia Seminary—one of our best girls' schools & gave the day to its business.

June 12 I delivered the Commencement Sermon for Wofford College (white) M[ethodist] E[piscopal] C[hurch] South, at Spartanburg, S. C. That night I delivered a lecture in the city to a colored audience (whites visitors in numbers) on the education of the race.

Next week commencement here.

June 25 I delivered the Commencement Sermon for the University of Mississippi at Oxford. That evening at 4 a lecture in town to the colored people—whites present in numbers—on my specialty, that night, by special request, an address to the Y. M. C. A. in the University chapel. *You* will see that my lectures to the colored people on these occasions was worth more to them by the indorsement put on me by the big white colleges in the morning.

July 8 to Aug. 2 I gave to Texas. I was urged to go there on account of my

supposed influence with colored people. I wrote to the Prohibition Committee that if I gave Texas part of my time for some weeks I would do so in my character as Slater Agent. I was everywhere received in that character, and, if I am any judge, did the best month's work I ever did anywhere for negro education. In 25 days I made 27 speeches, average two hours, & preached 4 sermons. In Texarkana I began & wound up in Galveston. I took the Trinity & Brazos valley regions for the first half—the Colorado & San Jacinto the rest. My audiences were from 500 to 5000—would average 2000 I think. Most of them in Opera houses or the open air.

Discussing temperance & prohibition I also pressed home the necessity of negro education—the blessedness of emancipation & of a restored union. My friend, God was with me. I believe I spoke & preached to 60,000 people. Hundreds of negro preachers & teachers came to me & I advised & encouraged as best as I could. I believe that my Texas campaign was the best I ever had opportunity to make for the colored man's interests.

I visited at Dallas the new building in process by the Bible Christians for colored education and gave needed advice. Did the same at Waco for our school there. A new building is about to be started.

I am at home & in health—though I was very tired for three days—a thing I never knew before. I am all right now & will devote most of August that is left to getting my office affairs & plans for the fall & winter in shape.

This is a long letter—but I have been busy. With very best wishes

Y'r friend,

A. G. HAYGOOD

Hon. R. B. Hayes

Decatur, Ga. Nov. 16, 1887

Dear Mr. Hayes:

The writer of the inclosed was the head of the Lincoln University—Marion, Ala. See report (I mail one) page 24.[20] Some excitement rose in Marion by a fight between a white student of Howard College (Baptist) & one of the Lincoln boys. Birmingham wanted the Baptists to move Howard College there. They argued that Lincoln close by was bad for Howard. Marion hoping to save Howard managed, by using the rencontre between the white & colored boy—to induce the Legislature to set up a State School for colored people somewhere else. The Legislature made the appropriation & made Governor [Thomas] Seay, an advanced man, head of the Board to locate etc. The new school was set up in Montgomery & opens as you see from Mr. [W. B.] Patterson's letter. There was an effort to enjoin Gov. Seay. He went ahead & the ridiculous thing died of itself. At his request I went to Montgomery in the summer for conference as to location, plan, etc. It is a great gain to the State School to have had this removal. The upshot is

[20] Refers to *Proceedings of the Trustees of the John F. Slater Fund for the Education of Freedmen, 1886* (Hampton, Va., 1886).

significant: the colored school (as a State institution) was moved from Marion & set up in Montgomery, with a larger appropriation. The Birmingham people got Howard away from Marion & the Marion people are minus a white college & the American Missionary Association have taken up the work at Marion. I did what I could to bring this about—because Marion is right at the edge of the "Corn-brake lands," sustaining a large negro population. I have taken the responsibility to say to Mr. Patterson that the Slater Fund will provide $200 for his Montgomery Shops, in order to lease in Marion the outfit we gave there.

The $650 he speaks of as needed for the work at Marion I did not absolutely promise. I said—if the A[merican] M[issionary] A[ssociation] takes up the Marion School & carries it on the Slater Fund will help if it can.

I think this $650 ought to be placed at Marion—the school is in the right place—we have been helping there, with good results. They will work on our line. I submit the core—see report p. 6.

The schools never opened as well as this Fall.

Have just returned from S. Carolina & go to Florida this week. Our Jacksonville school starts well.

Y'rs. very truly,

A. G. HAYGOOD

Decatur Ga., Jan. 17, 1888

Dear Mr. Hayes:

In a few days I will send you a copy of the Christian Advocate—Nashville. It contains a four column article by our senior Bishop. He is also Regent of Vanderbilt University. The Advocate is the organ of the Southern Methodist General Conference—circulation 30,000 & over. Our late Senior threw cold water on the negro education business. Our present Senior, while still "behind the procession" writes the article I send you. Our people will come to *their* duty slowly —but the debate is over as to the general question. No man with a future in church or state—writes or speaks against the general proposition. Trinity Church (Southern Methodist) Atlanta—largest & richest in Georgia, last Sunday raised nearly $1,000 for Paine Institute—the leading men fully committing themselves to the work. The Nashville editor writes me that he places Mrs. Hayes' name on his complimentary list. I have just returned from Macon, Ga. Our Lewis Institute there is now under splendid management & the industrial idea runs through everything.

I hesitate to trouble you with such frequent letters—but I send a letter from Dr. Dunton. The progress at Claflin[21] is amazing. Our industrial notions are revolutionizing the whole movement. I rejoice and take courage.

Y'rs very truly,

A. G. HAYGOOD

Hon. R. B. Hayes

[21] Claflin University, Orangeburg, South Carolina, Dr. L. M. Dunton, president.

Decatur, Ga., Oct. 17, 1888

Dear Mr. Hayes:

The drafts for just payments on appropriations for 1888-89 have been sent out and I have reports of the Fall openings. The beginnings are good; considering the yellow fever trouble, remarkably good. I sent to each member a letter containing items of special interest.

1. In Florida, Ala., Miss. & La. the yellow fever—the panic more than the fever except in Florida—has hindered more or less. The Jacksonville school[22] will, it is expected, open Dec. 3. Mr. Artrell, the Principal a negro—has been the Chief of the Colored people's Relief Society. He has done heroic service & won universal praise. The schools in New Orleans suffer a slight delay; so do those near Jackson, Miss.—the teachers were North when the quarantine was set up. They will all be in place in a few days now; none of our teachers have been stricken.

2. At several of our schools there is notable building activity. In each case as I learn, the aid received from the John F. Slater Fund has led to the gifts that made the new buildings possible. At Brainerd Institute, Chester, S. C., a $10,000 building is under way. It will nearly double the capacity of the school. An extra $250 last year started this work, so Mr. [S.] Loomis [principal] says.

At Fisk the building for gymnasium and the industrial departments, mentioned in last report, 80 x 40 to cost about $12,000 is well under way.

At Gilbert,[23] Godman our friend is on "a boom" in work & hope. The building completed last spring greatly increased their capacity for taking care of students. The aid from the Slater Fund has led to large things in the Industrial Department. Mr. [W. L.] Gilbert [Winsted, Connecticut] has pledged $5,000 for an adequate Industrial building. Dr. Godman is jubilant.

At Claflin, S. C. owing to the liberality of the state in response to Governor [John P.] Richardson's earnest recommendations, large extension has been made to the Industrial plant. A $1200 barn has been completed; a shop with machinery & tools costing $3,000 also completed—only $180 of Slater money being used in this splendid outfit. Between the Freedmen's Aid Society & Governor Claflin a chapel—needed a long time—80x90 is provided for & under way.

The "S. C. Armstrong Hall," Tuskegee, Ala., designed by our carpentry teacher, a negro—& built by student labor except the tin roof—is finished. Mr. [Booker T.] Washington, Principal, is now arranging for a $1200 barn for the uses of the institution & instruction in the farming & cattle departments. Washington is a very remarkable NEGRO—a mulatto.

Meharry Medical College [Nashville] is to have a new & very important building—cornerstone to be laid Oct. 23.

[22] Jacksonville Graded School, Jacksonville, Florida, Rev. W. M. Artrell, principal.
[23] Gilbert Seminary, Baldwin, Louisiana, Rev. W. S. Goodman, president.

Biddle University, Charlotte, N. C. only began the industrial lines a year ago. They are convinced & extend their work.

The chief building at Rush, Holly Springs, Miss. [which] burned last March is being restored.

Additional room for the Industrial Departments has been provided at Straight University [New Orleans].

The new brick building at Spelman [Female Institute], Atlanta, to take the place of the old wooden structure, burned a year ago, well advanced.

By the liberality of Mr. Ballard a $12,000 building has been provided for Lewis Institute, Macon, Ga.

The plans of the Board for making an *object lesson* at one of the schools well advanced—at Clark University, Atlanta. The $5,000 brick building Mr. Ballard's gift, was built in time for our enlarged work there. I have given a great deal of attention to this new departure at Clark since our meeting. We will get some contributions from Atlanta. The work is going on under most capable direction. I will nurse it well & report from time to time.

I am sure that nearly all the money given to these schools for buildings—except as to those burned—was *induced* by the work wrought through the Slater aid.[24] This Slater money breeds—dollar for dollar.

The brainiest man in the next Ga. Legislature has promised me to lay himself out for a law bringing our public schools to efficiency. Wrote me yesterday for all I had printed. I am getting up for him information full and conducive on the whole subject. Providence leads me & helps me.

I write to the rest of the Board—stopping at the word dollar above.

Y'rs. truly,

A. G. HAYGOOD

Hon. R. B. Hayes

Decatur, Ga., Nov. 8, 1888

Dear Mr. Hayes:

It is President Harrison & may God make him a blessing to the whole country.

I met Mr. [Henry W.] Grady yesterday in Atlanta. I said: "Mr. Grady—is there any hope for Cleveland?" He said—"None in the world." I replied "Now Grady, boom Georgia." He said ["]I am going to copy your letter Sunday.["] He meant the one I sent you in the Wesl[e]yan Chris[tian] A[d]v[ocate]—on Georgia's public schools.

The letter has struck fire. The pastor of the leading Georgia Methodist Church —Trinity in Atlanta—invites me to preach in his pulpit on the subject of the education of the masses—Sunday night week with special effort to get out the

[24] By the terms of the gift, the Trustees were not allowed to use money for land or buildings.

Legislature. I am now doing my utmost to get Mr. Grady thoroughly committed to it—& believe I will succeed.

If Georgia makes her public schools what they ought to be the rest will follow. I was to have visited some schools this week. I put it off to get ready to speak to the Legislature & the people on the great question of public education.

I believe I can do nothing more useful to the Slater Fund just now than what I propose & purpose.

The Election was quiet—the Republicans carried two wards in Atlanta. The negroes who wished voted—polling heavy votes in some places. They were in great force in Atlanta. There is disappointment here—no excitement that won't die out in a few days. Some pessimists fear more Federal interference—re reconstruction etc. I tell them no; if there were no other reason, there is too much money invested by Northern people in the South. If General Harrison carries on the policy you inaugurated four years more will about put sectionalism out of politics in this country. I understand that he is a good clean man—who fears God & does right. I can ask no more than this in my President.

No frost yet in this place—

Y'rs truly & ever,

A. G. HAYGOOD

Hon. R. B. Hayes

Decatur, Ga., Feb. 18, 1889

Dear Mr. Hayes:

Do pardon this—I know the delicacy of your position. You need not in any way answer this. It is on my conscience to write it, in the common interests. My anxiety for peace & progress is my excuse. General [William] Mahone in the Cabinet is a source of irritation. The Southern people will grow "harder of heart" under him in a Cabinet position. I believe I know the drifts of sentiment in the Southern states as well as most men. A man like Mahone will solidify Bourbonism. Unless the natural movement among us is arrested the South is going to divide on National issues on economic & business considerations. Above all things—we need to have done with the solid South. The germs of the new movement are everywhere. If Mahone's Virginia methods are used they will fall on these tender shoots like a black frost. Our people have no faith in Gen'l Mahone. They don't believe he has any convictions.

I have not a personal or family interest in the business. I am speaking to you what I have believed since November—that Ex. Governor [Rufus B.] Bullock is a man every way fitter for a Cabinet place. He has brains—business habits—business training—knowledge of men & of public affairs. He is moreover—a gentleman. I believe that his record is as good as the best who might be thought of. There is now no prejudice against him in Georgia. He has been an unflinch-

ingly consistent Republican all the way. Everybody knows this—he has not made offerings to our Democratic sentiments. He has been a steadfast Republican & is in Georgia, easily, its foremost and best man.

This much I have written because it is in my heart to do it. I need not even know that you receive it.

Y'rs truly,

A. G. HAYGOOD

Hon. R. B. Hayes

Sheffield, Ala.,
June 11, 1890

My dear Friend:

I reached home yesterday. Last Thursday at 11 a. m. I spoke in Montgomery, Ala. to a great crowd—at the commencement of the State Normal School for colored people. Thursday night preached to our people. Friday morning went through the industrial exhibits & plans for next year. During past year 175 girls were taught sewing in all ordinary branches & 90 boys hand-tools, carpentry, turning & such like. Their success has been great. Sunday a. m. I preached commencement sermon for the leading school our church has in the gulf states. That evening at 4 an address on Negro Education in the African Methodist Church—about 40 leading white preachers & citizens present.

You will not think that my consenting to ordination means the least decadence of interest in the uplifting of the Negro & the many-sided interests that rise or fall with him. I dared not say "no," this second time—with so overwhelming a sentiment urging me—the largest vote (I am told by those who have minute knowledge in such matters) ever cast for any Bishop in our church. There was a strange enthusiasm about it—the outburst when the counting showed that it was done stopped proceedings for several minutes. The Evening paper said "Almost a tumult." I was not there—had not seen the Conference at all. I mention these little things to show you with what an emphasis the demand was made on me. You speak of it as an "immense personal triumph." Considering that there was some prejudice against me for declining in 1882 & the fierce fire I was under so long, what you say is true. But I know you understand that *this* had nothing to do with my acceptance of the place.

As to the Agency—I don't wish to retain it one day after it is thought best to make other arrangements. I have not thought of other than a very modified relation after next Annual meeting. I know I can manage the year we have entered on & I would like to "round up" the work laid out May 6 in N. York. But—I wish nothing that sacrifices the least interest—or harmony. If I remain in charge till next May I wish to prepare a sort of resume or final statement—reviewing, gathering up in one full, brief statement what we have sought & what we have done.

I hear of many applicants—Northern and Southern—for the Slater Agency. Letters come to me about my successor & letters come to me almost daily urging me not to let go all relation to it etc. The ablest woman I know in our church wrote me yesterday. Leading lay men—preachers & about half the principals of the schools related to us write in the same tone. I answer politely that the matters have not been discussed as yet, etc. This further—rather it is the same thing over: Don't let any view I have embarrass your views or your action in the least. I hope great good will grow out of the Mohonk Conference. I see an Atlanta paper this morning says I made a speech there!

Y'rs Faithfully,

A. G. HAYGOOD

Hon. R. B. Hayes

A CANADIAN VIEW OF PARTIES AND ISSUES ON THE EVE OF THE CIVIL WAR

Edited by JAMES J. TALMAN

Among the most valuable documents in the Ontario Archives are the Clarke Papers,[1] while in that collection the most valuable letters are those from George Sheppard to Charles Clarke. Most of Sheppard's letters deal with Canadian politics but five of them are of interest to the South.

Sheppard was born about 1820 at Newark-on-Trent, England. After a varied newspaper career in England he migrated to America in 1850 where, it is said, he founded an English colony in Iowa or in Illinois, near the Iowa border.[2] However, he was disappointed in the project and went to Washington where he became associate editor of the *Daily Republic.* From 1854 to 1857 he was connected with the actuarial department of the Canada Life Insurance Company. In the autumn of 1857 he returned to journalism as editor of the Toronto *Daily Colonist.*

[1] Presented to the Ontario Archives by Mrs. Rose E. Clarke of Detroit.

[2] The sources do not agree. Search has failed to disclose any settlement, in either state, with which Sheppard was identified. I am indebted to Dr. Benjamin F. Shambaugh, superintendent of the State Historical Society of Iowa, and Mr. Paul M. Angle, librarian, Illinois State Historical Library, for having the searches made.

I hear of many applicants—Northern and Southern—for the Slater Agency. Letters come to me about my successor & letters come to me almost daily urging me not to let go all relation to it etc. The ablest woman I know in our church wrote me yesterday. Leading lay men—preachers & about half the principals of the schools related to us write in the same tone. I answer politely that the matters have not been discussed as yet, etc. This further—rather it is the same thing over: Don't let any view I have embarrass your views or your action in the least. I hope great good will grow out of the Mohonk Conference. I see an Atlanta paper this morning says I made a speech there!

Y'rs Faithfully,

A. G. HAYGOOD

Hon. R. B. Hayes

A CANADIAN VIEW OF PARTIES AND ISSUES ON THE EVE OF THE CIVIL WAR

Edited by JAMES J. TALMAN

Among the most valuable documents in the Ontario Archives are the Clarke Papers,[1] while in that collection the most valuable letters are those from George Sheppard to Charles Clarke. Most of Sheppard's letters deal with Canadian politics but five of them are of interest to the South.

Sheppard was born about 1820 at Newark-on-Trent, England. After a varied newspaper career in England he migrated to America in 1850 where, it is said, he founded an English colony in Iowa or in Illinois, near the Iowa border.[2] However, he was disappointed in the project and went to Washington where he became associate editor of the *Daily Republic.* From 1854 to 1857 he was connected with the actuarial department of the Canada Life Insurance Company. In the autumn of 1857 he returned to journalism as editor of the Toronto *Daily Colonist.*

[1] Presented to the Ontario Archives by Mrs. Rose E. Clarke of Detroit.

[2] The sources do not agree. Search has failed to disclose any settlement, in either state, with which Sheppard was identified. I am indebted to Dr. Benjamin F. Shambaugh, superintendent of the State Historical Society of Iowa, and Mr. Paul M. Angle, librarian, Illinois State Historical Library, for having the searches made.

In 1859 Sheppard, then an editorial writer for the Toronto *Globe,* took a prominent part in the reform convention of that year but his stand cost him his position and he joined the Hamilton *Times.* On July 8, 1860, he wrote that he hoped to go to the United States; by October 8 he was in Washington. It was at this time, while serving on the staff of the Washington *Constitution,* that Sheppard wrote the letters of which extracts are given below. They reveal an accurate impression of the business depression in Washington during the winter of 1860-1861, and they indicate a partisan editorial writer's strong leanings toward the principles of the Breckinridge party. Sheppard's statement in his letter of February 4, that only "the personal popularity & the strong appeals of Toombs, Jefferson Davis, & others like them" had kept the South Carolinians from firing upon Fort Sumter, is worth noting.

Sheppard soon returned to Canada and joined the editorial staff of the Toronto *Leader* which took such a strong stand over the *Trent* affair that the New York *Times,* January 1, 1862, hinted that Sheppard was in the pay of Jefferson Davis. From 1862 to 1864 he was at Quebec; later he went to the New York *Times* as a writer of political articles. In 1869 he took over the direction of the editorial page but soon returned to his previous position. He died at Jamaica Plain, Boston, in 1912.[3]

Charles Clarke, to whom the letters below were written, was born in England in 1826. He migrated to Canada in 1843 and settled near Elora, Canada West (now Ontario). In 1871 he was elected a member of the legislative assembly of Ontario for Wellington Centre and represented that constituency continuously until 1894. He was speaker of the assembly from 1880 to 1885 and from 1901 to 1907 was clerk of the assembly. He died in 1909.[4]

[3] Henry J. Morgan, *Sketches of Celebrated Canadians* (Quebec, 1862), 659; *id., Bibliotheca Canadensis* (Ottawa, 1867), 345-47; John R. Robertson, *Landmarks of Canada* (Toronto, 1917), 77; George W. Brown, "The Grit Party and the Great Reform Convention of 1859," in *Canadian Historical Review* (Toronto, 1920-), XVI (1936), 245-65; Fred Landon, "The Trent Affair of 1861," *ibid.,* III (1923), 48-57; Elmer Davis, *History of the New York Times, 1851-1921* (New York, 1921), 84-86.

[4] W. Stewart Wallace (comp.), *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* (Toronto, 1926), 84-85.

Washington, D. C. Oct 8, 1860.

My dear Clarke:

. . . . . .

I must again begin at the beginning, I suppose. Having read to you the private epistle w^h^ invited me hither, you know under what circumstances I came. The vague hope encouraged by my friend was realized on my arrival. Without stopping to higgle [*sic*] about terms, I came to an understanding with the chairman of the Breckinridge Committee in reference to writing during the remainder of the campaign; & forthwith I proceeded to work. Unfortunately I overtasked myself. . . . The M. D. forbade all labor, but to give up *that* w^d^ have been to give up the whole chance. . . .

Of course this second 'shake' fills me with misgivings. The *South* had been marked out for future effort, as well by my deliberate choice as by the purposes of my friends, personal & political. The editorship of a Virginia paper has been spoken of for me, after the campaign; but the Doctor counsels me to decline, & to look rather to the mountains & sea breezes of New England. As things are, however, this is idle talk. The present gives me quite enough to think about & do. My aim is to nurse myself through the campaign, which will terminate exactly a month hence, & to come out of it with an assurance that I have not belied the expectations of my friends. . . .

. . . . . .

You don't want me to inflict upon you a tedious essay upon parties, candidates, & so forth, as seen in the fight now in progress? I am on the Breckinridge side, as you know—not because I admire the man, but because I am convinced that the platform upon w^h^ he stands is the only platform compatible with the maintenance of the Union—the only one in harmony with the constitution, & the long-recognized principles of the Democratic party. Besides, so far as my personal knowledge goes, I like the southern politicians & people better than those of the north & west: they are more truly liberal, more generous, & vastly more devoted to principle. You can't buy or bully them, as northern politicians & voters are bought & bullied. The Bell-Everett party are the Know Nothings, & to foreign born folk that is enough to condemn them. Douglas is personally a charlatan, a selfish & desperate adventurer, bankrupt in fortune & character. His squatter sovereignty doctrine is illogical, at variance with constitutional principles, & wholly unsatisfactory in practice. The Lincoln party, though the antipodes of the Southrons, are next to them in the force & logical strength of their principles. My reading of the constitution makes me what is known as a State Rights' Democrat. Were that construction rendered impossible, I should be "a black republican," rather than a "squatter sovereign" or the miserable dog in the manger called a Know Nothing.

As to the issue of the contest, the odds are in my opinion in favor of Lincoln's

success; though that is by no means so certain as you may have been led to suppose.

Of this I am confident—if Lincoln be elected, there will be trouble in the country of a kind not seen by the present generation. Abolitionism & the Union cannot coexist. And if an anti slavery party for the time triumph, the Union will not be worth three months' purchase. Ten years ago I heard southern threats upon this subject. But the temper now visible in the south bears no resemblance to that wh has been spoken of on previous occasions. The stern resolves, the hearty unity of opinion, the universality of the conviction that the final issue of life or death must now be met & disposed of whatever be the consequences: these are things to wh there has been no parallel since the formation of the government.

It is because I anticipate Lincoln's election, & because I am sure that that occurrence will develop an era of revolution, that I am anxious—or, at least, desirous—to manage so that I shall remain here throughout the winter. . . .

. . . . . .

Your Friend,

Geo. Sheppard.

Washington, D. C., Nov 5/60.

My dear Clarke—

. . . . . .

My expectation, as you are aware, has been, to revisit Toronto immediately after the election. This expectation will not be realized. For although the positive engagement entered into terminates with the canvass, my friends deem it essential for me to be 'on hand.' So far, my success, professionally considered, has exceeded my hopes. I have regained the standing wh I foolishly surrendered seven years ago, & have won a character wh, *if peace continue,* will be of great service to me. The proprietor of the *Constitution,* to wh I have been the principal contributor, has intimated an intention to make me a permanent offer; & from high political quarters I receive expressions of satisfaction, elicited by the work I have done. You will not attribute the mention of the fact to conceit, I'm sure. I tell it to you because I know that you will share the pleasure I cannot but feel at a success achieved amidst many difficulties.

Whether the *Constitution* offer will actually be made, or whether, in any shape, I realize the fruits of my industry, remains to be seen. We are in a crisis which shakes all contracts, & renders all arrangements exceedingly precarious. Tomorrow will decide more than the presidency. It will determine the fate of the Union. I speak honestly, & in no partisan sense. You in the far north have no conception of the trouble that will follow Lincoln's election, wh I fear may be regarded as a certainty. My associations enable me to declare confidently that Lincoln's success will be followed by revolution, peaceful or bloody. The

wealthy southern states are already in quasi revolt. The revolutionary cockade is seen even here; & the 4th of March next will witness the secession of states & the formation of a southern confederacy. My conviction is that that step will be justifiable—that, in truth, it will be a measure of self defence, forced upon the slaveholding states by the assaults of a horde of fanatics, whose benevolence expends itself upon a race marked by God for a condition of servitude.

In view of future federation in British America, any action taken by the south in the direction of secession will involve questions worthy of yr careful study. Can a state constitutionally withdraw from a federal union? Can a state constitutionally resist what its people consider the unfriendly attitude of the federal government? In other words, does a state, in entering into a federal alliance, relinquish its sovereignty? The states' right doctrine is, that a state retains its sovereignty & may therefore secede. The doctrine follows logically from the Jefferson idea of democracy—was irrefragably expounded by Calhoun—& permeates southern politics, & also the national section of the northern democracy. The old federal notion of a strong central government covers exactly the opposite conclusions. In this contest I know where your principles will place you, howsoever strong may be your partiality for the nigger-worshipping, foreigner hating republicans.

I refer to these points, however, simply to direct your thoughts to a vital issue in the pending controversy, & not to bother you with party considerations, in wh you can feel but the most general interest. Excuse me, if I've said too much.

. . . . . .

Believe me,

Faithfully yr friend,

Geo. Sheppard.

Chas. Clarke Esq Elora, C[anada] W[est]

. . . . . .

Washington, D. C., Dec. 17, 1860.

My dear Clarke—

. . . . . .

I need not undertake to describe matters here & throughout the south. They are almost indescribable. Whatever newspaper accounts you read fail to convey an idea of the state of the controversy between the two sections, & the hopelessness of everything like reconciliation. My honest belief is that nothing under heaven can avert secession of five or six states; & that, instead of wasting words about plans of compromise, the wiser course for all parties would be to address themselves to the peaceable arrangement of the terms upon wh the separation shall be conducted. Only by such a course can civil war be prevented.

Meanwhile the prostration of every interest & enterprise exceeds anything I have ever seen. This city, wh at this season has hitherto been full of life, & over-

flowing with prosperity, is now the picture of desolation. Few strangers are here; the hotels & restaurants are deserted; storekeepers are not covering expenses; & property owners see naught but ruin. This state of things must continue until the 4th of March. Whether it will then change for the better or worse, I venture not to prophecy [*sic*]. My opinion is, that if no amicable arrangement be come to in the meantime—if the secession be not recognized in a friendly spirit, & any disposition be shown to resort to coercion—the 4th March will witness a conflict in the streets of Washington. Let blood be shed, & the horrors of the first French revolution will be reënacted.

Individually, of course, I suffer with the rest. Of work I have plenty, but payment is almost *uncomeatable.* How I shall proceed when the crisis reach[es] the decisive point, I know not. My convictions are with the South. I hold that it is in the right—that its claims are just, constitutional, necessary—that their recognition by the northern fanatics is not to be hoped for—& therefore that the South is bound by every consideration of honor & interest to withdraw from the Union & organize an independent Confederacy. I hold, further, that the Federal System implies the maintenance of State sovereignty, & that that, again, involves the right of secession. On the merits of the quarrel, then, I am with the South. But as yet I don't see any opening for myself, personally, in the South, except in districts not favorable to my own or my family's health.

So far, however, I have no cause of complaint. My position equals my highest expectations; & if my prospects are dark & dreary, I do but share the misfortunes of millions. With all its inconveniences, this crisis is a study wh I wd not readily have foregone. There has been nothing like it in our day.

. . . . . .

Ever faithfully,
Geo. Sheppard.

Chas. Clarke Esq., Elora, C[anada] W[est]

Washington, D. C; Jan. 24, 1861.

My dear Clarke—

Your letter of the *12th* reached me *last Thursday,* & afforded me sincere gratification. The previous letter to wh you refer—Dec. 26th—*never came to hand,* & I often wondered at your silence. As a general rule, however, I can't complain of postal irregularities, I have had some four or five miscarriages since coming here, but acquaintances have had many more. I thank you for yr abstract of McGee's[5] lecture, & concur in his views as to the tendency of American disunion to hasten a closer alliance between the Canadas & the northern states. It is a mistake, however, to suppose that the slavery question is the sole cause of secession. In a

[5] Thomas D'Arcy McGee, a Canadian orator, writer, and politician.

letter[6] wh I last night addressed to the *Leader* I have briefly indicated other causes; & in a series of letters[7] addressed in Novr & Dec. to the Ottawa *Citizen* I discussed in detail the influences of mind & habit & interest & principle wh render the north & South two peoples. I see nothing that shd occasion regret in the fact of separation. The principles of popular government do not suffer; for two republics, side by side, can afford no more consolation to monarchists than one. The *States* are the true embodiments of democracy, & their individuality remains as before. Nay, the South, in asserting state sovereignty, gives an impetus to democratic principles; & it will be curious & profitable to watch the relative working of the two systems when the Southern Confederacy shall be under weigh.

But I fear that the country, especially the South, has a terrible trial to pass through, before these troubles end. Everybody hopes for a pacific solution—a friendly parting; but nobody can assign a reason for the slightest hope upon the subject. Whether civil war come or not, the injury done to business interests, to industry, to every man living by labor, is almost indescribable. Cases of insanity are frequent hereabout, occasioned by losses of property; & our principal city physician tells me that the rapid increase of nervous disorders, tending to insanity, is beyond all precedent. The well-to-do amongst the naturalized citizens are disposed to leave the country. Some are preparing to go to their native countries; & one man, an Englishman who has been here 30 years, starts in a few weeks for the Cape of Good Hope!

. . . . . .

No enterprise is suffering more than newspapers, north & south. In this city there is not a paper at this moment unembarrassed, & in a brief period two, perhaps three, will die. Of mere position, professionally or politically, one has more than enough, but it implies constant labor, & in these times nominal reward. With large amounts owing, it is difficult to meet current board-bills. The proprietor of the *Constitution,* the secession journal of this city, proposes to remove his concern to the capital of the Southern Confederacy, wherever it may be, & asks me to go with him. In the absence of other openings, I may go. At any rate I expect to visit Alabama, early in February, to be present at the convention called to organize the provisional government.

. . . . . .

Faithfully yours,
Geo. Sheppard.

Chas. Clarke, Esq., Elora, Canada West.

[6] This letter, unsigned and dated January 24, was printed in the Toronto *Leader,* January 29, 1861, and was reprinted in the *Weekly Leader,* February 1. Other dispatches, evidently sent by Sheppard, were printed in the *Leader,* December 18, 24, 1860; January 2, 5, 7, 15, 19, February 7, 13, 18, 25, March 2, 9, 11, 18, 26, and April 1, 8, 1861, and were reprinted in the *Weekly Leader.*

[7] These, headed "From our Washington Correspondent," were printed in the Ottawa

[Washington] Feb. 4-Monday Aftn [1861]

My dear Clarke,

I have yours of the 29th, & I thank you for your promptitude. I culled a few articles fm the *Constitution,* to show my standing ground in the controversy, & these must serve for the time as a substitute for a copy of the paper. As the secession organ, its worth here was accomplished when the secession of the cotton states was completed, & its publication has been suspended to admit of the removal of type & machinery to the South, where the paper will hereafter be published—I suppose as the oracle of the new Confederacy. I see that you still indulge in *ifs* concerning disunion. They are superfluous. There is no longer an *if* in the question. The Union *is* dissolved beyond hope of repair or reconstruction. The real South *has* seceded, & time will but render the breach wider & wider. In the end, I am satisfied that the Southern Confederacy will be *the* Confederacy of the continent. The London *Times* at length discerns this fact, as you may have learnt fm one of its latest articles. The resources, the geographical advantages, the scope for expansion, all point to Southern power. It will have as the *Times* says, "The most magnificent domain in the world" & the pharisaical north will wake up to find itself an inferior country "with no higher destiny than Canada." Excuse me for saying that when you talk of "the gradual extinction of slavery," as a result to be acquiesced in by the whole Union, as it was, you commit the ordinary abolition blunder. The South defends slavery of the negro, as *per se,* good; & the whole aspect of the controversy is changed thereby. My own conviction is that slavery is the proper condition of the negro on this continent; & that only slave labor can cultivate the soil wh is exposed to the burning sun & the poisonous exhalations of the cotton, rice, & sugar districts. The experience of the British West Indies affords all the proof I need, of the ruin that follows emancipation—of the ineradicable laziness & vice of the negro when suffered to be his own master. There is nothing in the mere name. And I am sure that the servitude of the negro upon a southern plantation differs but nominally in actual bondage from that of the hired white man in mines & factories. The *bona fide* difference is in favor of the nigger. In another respect you err. The southern people have many faults, but, whatever they be, lack of courage is not amongst them. In readiness for fight, they have no equals. Accustomed to the use of arms from boyhood, they are skilled to a high degree. Exposed constantly to influences wh make every man the guardian of his own "honor," they carry their lives upon their sleeves, & will fight at any moment with as much coolness as you & I eat our breakfast. In persistent pluck, perhaps,

Citizen, November 2, 6, December 4, 5, 21, 1860, and were continued in 1861 for some time. The dispatches to the *Leader* and the *Citizen* were not identical. I am indebted to Mr. F. C. Jennings, librarian of the Carnegie Public Library, Ottawa, Canada, where the only file of the *Citizen* for this period is preserved, for this information and for comparing the dispatches.

no essential difference exists between north & south. Fairly roused, both will battle to the death. But in dash, & quickness, & willingness to face danger, there is no comparison; the South is ahead, as every northern man I know is willing to concede. As to the Charleston occurrences, remember that you read only the adverse representations. It suits the northern, anti-slavery press, to hold up the Southern people to derision as a race of braggarts; & to this circumstance may much of the prevailing alienation be attributed. That Fort Sumter was not attacked long ago, is a fact for w^{h} the South Carolinians must not be held responsible. The secession leaders have desired to prevent bloodshed, under a belief that such a calamity w^{d} complicate negotiations hereafter to be entered into between the new confederacy & the fag end of the Union; & I speak whereof I know, when I say that nothing but the personal popularity & the strong appeals of Toombs, Jefferson Davis, & others like them, have restrained the Carolinians thus far. They are ready, depend upon it; & when the trial comes, they will be fully equal to the best of Englishmen.

. . . . . .

Gratefully & faithfully,
Geo. Sheppard.

Book Reviews

Women's Life and Work in the Southern Colonies. By Julia Cherry Spruill. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938. Pp. viii, 426. Bibliography, illustrations. $5.00.)

This book is an important contribution to the social history of colonial America. The author's purpose indicates the encyclopedic treatment of women's life. It was, she says, "to find out as much as possible about the everyday life of women, their function in the settlement of colonies, their homes and domestic occupations, their social life and recreations, the aims and methods of their education, their participation in affairs outside the home, and the manner in which they were regarded by the law and by society in general." Inevitably the available records deal more with the woman in the mansion than with her sister in the hut, but the author's diligent search for information on these points has been surprisingly successful.

The first eight chapters deal with the domestic life of women. Women's homes, servants, courtships, husbands, children, clothes, and pastimes are treated in detail—185 pages of detail, none of it wearying. Two chapters deal with the intellectual interests of upper-class women, their schooling and libraries. The four following chapters treat women outside the home. Women in the Colonial period were doctors, teachers, lawyers (in the very early days), shopkeepers, ferryboat operators, planters, printers, actresses, tavern keepers; women engaged in fact in almost every activity except politics. They had little place in public affairs; not even the Revolution brought them out of their political obscurity. Jefferson hoped women would be "too wise to wrinkle their foreheads with politics" (p. 245), but most men never thought of women at all in connection with politics.

The last two chapters deal with legal problems. Women received equal punishments but unequal privileges under the law. "All women were without political rights, and generally wives were legal nonentities," for as soon as a woman married, "her legal existence was suspended or incorporated into that of her husband, who was regarded as her head and lord" (pp. 340, 341). That puts their position in law succinctly. Even though many women had property at one time or another during their lives, few ever knew what it was to control it, except during a few months of widowhood. Man and wife were one in the eyes of the law, and there could be no separate property rights. "Separate purses

between man and wife," said the *Spectator,* were as "unnatural as separate beds" (p. 366).

This is an honest study. The author could easily have attempted the light, rather flippant manner so affected by those who wish to popularize a subject. Instead, the results of serious, prolonged research are presented clearly, lucidly, and soberly, with no effort to cover up lack of material or to high-light the inherently interesting at the expense of the important but less vivid material.

The book is attractively gotten up. There is a fine bibliography of primary sources and an unusually full index. Perfectly delightful illustrations by Lucia Porcher Johnson combine with Mrs. Spruill's text to make a grand study of women, and by women, but for everybody.

Agnes Scott College PHILIP DAVIDSON

Crime and Punishment in Early Maryland. By Raphael Semmes. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. Pp. vii, 334. $3.00.)

Colonial Justice in Virginia: The Development of a Judicial System, Typical Laws and Cases of the Period. By George Lewis Chumbley. (Richmond: The Dietz Press, 1938. Pp. ix, 174. Bibliography. $3.00.)

The principal justification for considering these two works in one review is the similarity of their approach to the problems of colonial justice. When a generation ago Professor Chitwood prepared his able study of *Justice in Colonial Virginia,* the prevailing concern was with what was known as institutional history, which for practical purposes usually meant investigation, along functional and jurisdictional lines, of governmental institutions. The purpose of Messrs. Semmes and Chumbley is quite different. Their primary concern is with what is known as social history. The one does for seventeenth century Maryland about as good a job of police reporting as could be asked. The other, working largely in Williamsburg and writing perhaps with the tourists of that city in mind, endeavors to supplement the picture of colonial life to be had there by the modern visitor—a purpose, let it be said, with which the reviewer is entirely sympathetic.

Of the two, Dr. Semmes' volume merits the more serious attention. It is an unusual work, difficult to describe, and impossible to summarize. It is based upon painstaking research, contains an extraordinary amount of detail, and is skillfully constructed. Yet it is hardly to be called a study. There is no central thesis binding the various parts together. There seems to be no particular point that the author is anxious to make. To a remarkable extent he remains in the background, letting his material speak for itself. Much that might be done with this material he makes no attempt at all to do. For example, the chief value of the work lies in the fact that it is based upon court records, including those of the counties, but there is no effort toward a well-integrated study of such fundamental problems as were dealt with by Professor Morris in his *Studies*

in the History of American Law. Much will be found relating to such questions as women's rights at law and responsibility for tortious acts, but the basic principles of Maryland's evolving law will have to be worked out by the reader himself on the basis of the materials provided. By this it is not intended to criticize a man who has provided one very useful book for not having provided at the same time another useful book. The purpose is merely to indicate the nature of the work. And that, after all is said, is perhaps best done by simply saying that anyone who wants to find out, without ploughing through the many and weighty tomes of the *Maryland Archives*, what the people of Maryland went to court about in the seventeenth century can do so by reading this book. The statement taken alone does less than justice to its author, but that is his really important contribution.

The picture thus provided of colonial life will prove startling, even revolting, to some of his readers. The range of the subject matter is well enough indicated by the following chapter headings: "Trial, Punishment and Imprisonment"; "Houses, Clothing and Theft"; "Livestock and Hog Stealing"; "Servant Discipline and Punishment"; "Homicide, Assault and Suicide"; "Drunkenness, Profanity and Witchcraft"; "Adultery, Fornication and Bastardy"; "Defamation"; "Sickness, Chirurgery and Burials." Hundreds of quotations, direct from the court records, are introduced with absolutely no concession to squeamishness. The result is an unfolding story of life that was cruel, coarse, and almost unbelievably vulgar.

Those involved in court proceedings do not present the whole picture of any society. But they do present a highly significant part of the picture, and a part too frequently ignored heretofore in many studies of the Southern colonies. Judging by this work, several cherished popular convictions regarding our ancestors will be shaken, if not fully destroyed, by further investigation along these lines. One example is the view that the worst offences were restricted to the servant classes. There must have been a shortage of men of the "better sort," in some communities at least, when one commissioner of the county court, captain of militia, and sheriff in Kent County was not only illiterate, but was on various occasions called upon to answer charges of being a common swearer, a common drunkard, a cattle thief, and of beating his servants to death, while his wife was accused of adultery.

It would be helpful if the subject matter of the volume were more completely indexed. In addition to a brief topical index, there is a separate index of names. Persons with ancestors should be prepared for the worst.

By comparison, Mr. Chumbley's work is slight and disappointing. He relies principally upon the statutes, the published records of the council, and contemporary comment. He ranges over an extremely wide field for the space allotted to it. His treatment is frequently discursive, and he ventures into several larger

questions of interpretation without an adequate grasp of the work of other students. Principal interest attaches to his discussion of the hustings courts at Williamsburg, and the introduction of several unpublished items relating thereto from the Norton Papers.

New York University WESLEY FRANK CRAVEN

The Peopling of Virginia. By R. Bennett Bean. (Boston: Chapman & Grimes, Inc., 1938. Pp. viii, 302. Illustrations, charts, appendix, bibliography. $3.00.)

In his *The Peopling of Virginia,* Dr. Bean attempts "to present in brief the origins of the various groups of people who came to Virginia from time to time and to determine something of their racial composition" (p. 3).

The book is divided into three parts. Part I, a "Short Roman History of the Peopling of Virginia," traces briefly the growth of Virginia, indicating the location in the state of the chief groups of immigrants. Part II, "The Peopling of the Counties of Virginia," gives "short, short histories" of the one hundred counties of the commonwealth. There is a thumbnail sketch of each county, telling how it was formed, some of its principal families and individuals, and a table of percentages of names of different nationalities in the county, based on such lists as "Rent Rolls," "Well Known Families," "Tax Rolls," etc. Part III, "A Short Review of Some Measurements and Observations of Old Virginia Families," contains four chapters, "Stature," "Sitting Height and Leg Length," "Cephalic Index Head Length and Breadth," and "Hair and Eye Color." In them are included abstracts from monographs previously published. Here the author makes use of measurements not only of people of Old Virginia families but also of 6,150 others—white, Negro, and Filipino.

The Peopling of Virginia shows evidence of a great amount of work. Since Dr. Bean is an able professor of anatomy, a past president of the Anthropological Section of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and a writer of many monographs in his chosen field, the reviewer will assume that the anthropological side of the work is well done and will deal only with that part which lies within his own field of history.

It is unfortunate that the author did not consult with a professional historian familiar with Virginia history, for the usefulness of his book is impaired by a great many errors, and there are no footnotes for reference to authorities. A few of the errors are: The date for the settlement at Jamestown is given as June 22, 1607 (p. 3), and Norfolk is spoken of as the first settlement in Virginia (p. 68); "The year 1618 was a sad one. . . . Sir Thomas Smith, treasurer, returned to England leaving the colony $3,000 in debt" (p. 10); "Communism existed in Virginia up to this time, after which it became a King's Colony" (p. 12); George Mason "was the author of the Constitution of the United States" (p.

questions of interpretation without an adequate grasp of the work of other students. Principal interest attaches to his discussion of the hustings courts at Williamsburg, and the introduction of several unpublished items relating thereto from the Norton Papers.

New York University WESLEY FRANK CRAVEN

The Peopling of Virginia. By R. Bennett Bean. (Boston: Chapman & Grimes, Inc., 1938. Pp. viii, 302. Illustrations, charts, appendix, bibliography. $3.00.)

In his *The Peopling of Virginia,* Dr. Bean attempts "to present in brief the origins of the various groups of people who came to Virginia from time to time and to determine something of their racial composition" (p. 3).

The book is divided into three parts. Part I, a "Short Roman History of the Peopling of Virginia," traces briefly the growth of Virginia, indicating the location in the state of the chief groups of immigrants. Part II, "The Peopling of the Counties of Virginia," gives "short, short histories" of the one hundred counties of the commonwealth. There is a thumbnail sketch of each county, telling how it was formed, some of its principal families and individuals, and a table of percentages of names of different nationalities in the county, based on such lists as "Rent Rolls," "Well Known Families," "Tax Rolls," etc. Part III, "A Short Review of Some Measurements and Observations of Old Virginia Families," contains four chapters, "Stature," "Sitting Height and Leg Length," "Cephalic Index Head Length and Breadth," and "Hair and Eye Color." In them are included abstracts from monographs previously published. Here the author makes use of measurements not only of people of Old Virginia families but also of 6,150 others—white, Negro, and Filipino.

The Peopling of Virginia shows evidence of a great amount of work. Since Dr. Bean is an able professor of anatomy, a past president of the Anthropological Section of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and a writer of many monographs in his chosen field, the reviewer will assume that the anthropological side of the work is well done and will deal only with that part which lies within his own field of history.

It is unfortunate that the author did not consult with a professional historian familiar with Virginia history, for the usefulness of his book is impaired by a great many errors, and there are no footnotes for reference to authorities. A few of the errors are: The date for the settlement at Jamestown is given as June 22, 1607 (p. 3), and Norfolk is spoken of as the first settlement in Virginia (p. 68); "The year 1618 was a sad one. . . . Sir Thomas Smith, treasurer, returned to England leaving the colony $3,000 in debt" (p. 10); "Communism existed in Virginia up to this time, after which it became a King's Colony" (p. 12); George Mason "was the author of the Constitution of the United States" (p.

18); "the oldest American college at Henricus" (p. 22); "James Blair was the first Chancellor of the College [of William and Mary] and often has been called the Archbishop of Canterbury of Virginia" (p. 22).

There are some mistakes which are apparently errors in copying. As examples, Sir Edmund Sandys stands for Sir Edwin Sandys (p. 11); "Cromwell's" army was defeated at Guilford Court House (p. 155); and "Fort Christian" in Brunswick appears for Fort Christanna. The reviewer is also puzzled to know why the name Carrington is written in capitals on pages 142 and 143 instead of in the normal way, as on page 102.

Some very broad and dogmatic statements are made without apparent justification or authority, such as: "The Savage family came to Virginia in 1607, and they represent the oldest family still living in the United States" (p. 81); "the administration of Governor Yeardley whose two years of office were the most significant ever known in Virginia" (p. 12); "The greatest assembly that ever convened in Virginia met in 1776 in Williamsburg" (p. 34); "The rifles perfected by the Gunmakers of the Mountains of Virginia won the Revolution in the hands of Morgan's riflemen" (p. 36).

The bibliography suffers both from omissions and from commissions. T. D. Gold, for example, is named as the author of Fairfax Harrison's scholarly *Landmarks of Old Prince William,* and Hening is spelled "Henning."

College of William and Mary RICHARD L. MORTON

James Madison: Philosopher of the Constitution. By Edward McNall Burns. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1938. Pp. x, 212. Bibliography. $2.50.)

From a reading of this interesting and well-written study, it would appear that James Madison was not a great liberal—certainly not in the present-day sense of the term. He favored a representative republic, but opposed a pure democracy. He wished a three-year term for national representatives and a nine-year term for senators, and believed a three-fourths vote of Congress should be required to override a presidential veto. He did not believe unequivocally in universal manhood suffrage; he believed the chief end of government was the protection of property, in the broad sense, and that it would be well to have manhood suffrage for elections to one house and property qualifications for elections to the other. Clearly, he did not regard more democracy as the cure for democracy's ills. Like Hamilton, he believed protective tariffs were constitutional, and that they were a desirable means of bringing about a proper balancing of classes in the state. Like Jefferson, he deplored the institution of slavery, but continued to own slaves until his death. Unlike Calhoun, he regarded sovereignty as divisible and alienable and believed that an actual division of sovereignty was made by the Constitution of 1787 (p. 94). He disbelieved in the

18); "the oldest American college at Henricus" (p. 22); "James Blair was the first Chancellor of the College [of William and Mary] and often has been called the Archbishop of Canterbury of Virginia" (p. 22).

There are some mistakes which are apparently errors in copying. As examples, Sir Edmund Sandys stands for Sir Edwin Sandys (p. 11); "Cromwell's" army was defeated at Guilford Court House (p. 155); and "Fort Christian" in Brunswick appears for Fort Christanna. The reviewer is also puzzled to know why the name Carrington is written in capitals on pages 142 and 143 instead of in the normal way, as on page 102.

Some very broad and dogmatic statements are made without apparent justification or authority, such as: "The Savage family came to Virginia in 1607, and they represent the oldest family still living in the United States" (p. 81); "the administration of Governor Yeardley whose two years of office were the most significant ever known in Virginia" (p. 12); "The greatest assembly that ever convened in Virginia met in 1776 in Williamsburg" (p. 34); "The rifles perfected by the Gunmakers of the Mountains of Virginia won the Revolution in the hands of Morgan's riflemen" (p. 36).

The bibliography suffers both from omissions and from commissions. T. D. Gold, for example, is named as the author of Fairfax Harrison's scholarly *Landmarks of Old Prince William,* and Hening is spelled "Henning."

College of William and Mary RICHARD L. MORTON

James Madison: Philosopher of the Constitution. By Edward McNall Burns. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1938. Pp. x, 212. Bibliography. $2.50.)

From a reading of this interesting and well-written study, it would appear that James Madison was not a great liberal—certainly not in the present-day sense of the term. He favored a representative republic, but opposed a pure democracy. He wished a three-year term for national representatives and a nine-year term for senators, and believed a three-fourths vote of Congress should be required to override a presidential veto. He did not believe unequivocally in universal manhood suffrage; he believed the chief end of government was the protection of property, in the broad sense, and that it would be well to have manhood suffrage for elections to one house and property qualifications for elections to the other. Clearly, he did not regard more democracy as the cure for democracy's ills. Like Hamilton, he believed protective tariffs were constitutional, and that they were a desirable means of bringing about a proper balancing of classes in the state. Like Jefferson, he deplored the institution of slavery, but continued to own slaves until his death. Unlike Calhoun, he regarded sovereignty as divisible and alienable and believed that an actual division of sovereignty was made by the Constitution of 1787 (p. 94). He disbelieved in the

organic or revolutionary theory of the state and insisted that government had no inherent powers.

Madison said that the states had a *natural,* but not a *constitutional,* right of secession (pp. 124, 170-71). Mr. Burns asserts that the doctrine of "interposition" set forth in the Virginia Resolutions meant that encroachments by the Federal government upon the states might be corrected through amendments, changing the personnel of Congress, impeachments, and appeals to the Federal judiciary (p. 170). The reader is not told where such an explanation was found.

Madison did not regard the "general welfare clause" as a grant of power, but agreed nevertheless that Congress might go beyond enumerated powers (p. 160). He seems to have been much confused in his thinking about judicial review. According to the author, Madison thought that "Neither the executive nor judiciary should have any right to question an interpretation by Congress of what constitutes legislative authority" (pp. 132, 133, 161, 172). However, he believed in the right of the courts to pass upon the validity of legislation, "especially of the sort that affected private rights" (p. 155). How he could hold the latter view and still be in agreement with Jefferson's conception of the judiciary, as the author says he was (p. 185), is puzzling.

University of Tennessee JENNINGS B. SANDERS

The Writings of Sam Houston, 1813-1863. Volume I, *1813-1836.* Edited by Amelia W. Williams and Eugene C. Barker. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1938. Pp. xxi, 526. $3.25.)

It is perhaps safe to say that the careers of few important individuals in American history have been so extensively treated and at the same time so little understood as has that of Sam Houston. Involved in public affairs almost continuously from the War of 1812 to the Civil War and endowed with a peculiar gift for the type of forceful action and emphatic statement that stimulated controversy, he played a part which made it difficult for those associated with him to assume an attitude of neutrality where he was concerned. One was either his enthusiastic champion or his bitter opponent. As a result, he has been fictionized, dramatized, popularized, and glorified or vilified by numerous biographers, but the field is still open for a scholarly study of his career. Part of the difficulty, of course, has been the impossibility of getting at the materials on which such a biography would have to be based. Much of Houston's personal correspondence either is still in private hands or has been lost, while any effort to locate his official writings carries one from war department files in Washington to local archives in Texas and from early Arkansas newspapers to the *Congressional Globe.* For that reason, the attempt to compile, edit, and publish a complete record of his available writings represents a significant enterprise. The present plans provide for an edition of six volumes, for which the actual work of col-

organic or revolutionary theory of the state and insisted that government had no inherent powers.

Madison said that the states had a *natural,* but not a *constitutional,* right of secession (pp. 124, 170-71). Mr. Burns asserts that the doctrine of "interposition" set forth in the Virginia Resolutions meant that encroachments by the Federal government upon the states might be corrected through amendments, changing the personnel of Congress, impeachments, and appeals to the Federal judiciary (p. 170). The reader is not told where such an explanation was found.

Madison did not regard the "general welfare clause" as a grant of power, but agreed nevertheless that Congress might go beyond enumerated powers (p. 160). He seems to have been much confused in his thinking about judicial review. According to the author, Madison thought that "Neither the executive nor judiciary should have any right to question an interpretation by Congress of what constitutes legislative authority" (pp. 132, 133, 161, 172). However, he believed in the right of the courts to pass upon the validity of legislation, "especially of the sort that affected private rights" (p. 155). How he could hold the latter view and still be in agreement with Jefferson's conception of the judiciary, as the author says he was (p. 185), is puzzling.

University of Tennessee JENNINGS B. SANDERS

The Writings of Sam Houston, 1813-1863. Volume I, *1813-1836.* Edited by Amelia W. Williams and Eugene C. Barker. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1938. Pp. xxi, 526. $3.25.)

It is perhaps safe to say that the careers of few important individuals in American history have been so extensively treated and at the same time so little understood as has that of Sam Houston. Involved in public affairs almost continuously from the War of 1812 to the Civil War and endowed with a peculiar gift for the type of forceful action and emphatic statement that stimulated controversy, he played a part which made it difficult for those associated with him to assume an attitude of neutrality where he was concerned. One was either his enthusiastic champion or his bitter opponent. As a result, he has been fictionized, dramatized, popularized, and glorified or vilified by numerous biographers, but the field is still open for a scholarly study of his career. Part of the difficulty, of course, has been the impossibility of getting at the materials on which such a biography would have to be based. Much of Houston's personal correspondence either is still in private hands or has been lost, while any effort to locate his official writings carries one from war department files in Washington to local archives in Texas and from early Arkansas newspapers to the *Congressional Globe.* For that reason, the attempt to compile, edit, and publish a complete record of his available writings represents a significant enterprise. The present plans provide for an edition of six volumes, for which the actual work of col-

lecting and editing is being done by Miss Williams, while Dr. Barker is described in the preface as "an occasional consultant."

Volume I of this work, which is under consideration here, covers Houston's career as a lieutenant in the United States army, as a member of Congress from Tennessee, as governor of Tennessee, as United States Indian agent in the Southwest, as commander-in-chief of the Texas army during the revolution, and the first two months of his term as the first constitutional president of the Republic of Texas. The wide range represented in these activities complicates the problem of obtaining complete information, with the result that one of the most striking features of this volume is the number of gaps which appear in Houston's writings at important points—a shortcoming, by the way, for which the editors should not in any sense be blamed. The paucity of material for his early military activities can be explained by the fact that few people were likely to save the letters of a young lieutenant, if, indeed, he wrote letters. It is unfortunate, however, that the state of Tennessee has neglected to preserve even the official correspondence of a man who served it for four years as congressman and nearly two years as governor; and it is equally unfortunate that members of his family still withhold some of his personal papers from publication or examination, while the attitude of collectors "who will neither sell the originals nor furnish copies" (p. iii) of Houston materials in their possession leads one to wonder why some types of individuals are permitted to flourish.

In general, the documents in this volume are faithfully reproduced, and they are accompanied by a wealth of footnote material, which has been compiled by Miss Williams and which is little short of remarkable for the amount of detailed information furnished concerning individuals. One can only wish, however, that the footnotes themselves had been more carefully edited. Too often they leave the impression of a group of miscellaneous notes simply thrown together instead of being carefully planned. There is much irrelevant information and, frequently, there are obvious signs of confusion in the mind of the editor. The value of these notes for the average user is definitely reduced by many seemingly careless errors of fact on such matters as identification of individuals, dates of service, and other relatively minor points. Typographical errors are numerous and sometimes serious, while occasional awkward and even ungrammatical sentences might also have been eliminated by a careful proofreader.

One wonders why some of the documents should have been copied from newspapers or other indirect sources when the originals were available either in the University of Texas archives or in the state archives. In one case, the same document appears in two slightly different forms with dates exactly one year apart (pp. 298, 445). In another, the attempt to establish November 11 or 12, 1835, as the date of Houston's undated "Resolution to Annul Land Grants" (pp. 306-307) overlooks the fact that the journal of the Permanent Council shows that this resolution was adopted by that body on October 18, 1835. It

was printed in the *Telegraph and Texas Register,* October 26, 1835, and had already aroused a vigorous protest two weeks before November 11.

These defects do not, however, destroy the inherent value of the work as a whole. Its real significance lies in the fact that it brings together in easily accessible form all available Houston documents from both public and private collections, and thus provides a more adequate basis for the scholarly biography which one hopes will some day be written. A distinctive contribution has been made, also, in the discovery of hitherto unknown materials which throw new light on some of the obscure phases of Houston's career. Especially notable are the articles which he published in the *Arkansas Gazette* in 1830 concerning Indian affairs, and the correspondence between him and James Prentiss in 1832 concerning the interests of New York speculators in Texas lands. For this volume, alone, the student of Southwestern history must acknowledge a debt of gratitude to the editors and to the University of Texas for undertaking the enterprise. When the entire work is completed, it will unquestionably become not only an indispensable documentary collection for the study of Houston and of Texas, but also an essential source for the undertaking of many other aspects of American history during the first half of the nineteenth century.

Vanderbilt University WILLIAM C. BINKLEY

John Berrien Lindsley: Educator, Physician, Social Philosopher. By John Edwin Windrow. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938. Pp. xiii, 240. Illustrations, appendixes, bibliography. $4.00.)

John Berrien Lindsley was one of Tennessee's most gifted and versatile educators. As a physician, geologist, university president, minister of the gospel, champion of education and public health, European traveler and public speaker, essayist and editor, he led a useful, interesting, and occasionally dramatic life. It was through his leadership that Nashville became an important medical center in the Old and New South. He was instrumental in securing funds for the establishment of George Peabody College, an institution that has given valuable service to the cause of Southern education. In the period after the Civil War his name appears prominently in the campaign to make Tennessee public health conscious, and Nashville's conquest of the cholera peril was the result primarily of his insistence that the city develop a more adequate system of sanitation. Lindsley's life spanned three quarters of the nineteenth century, "a period of stark reality and tragedy" (p. viii). He came face to face with slavery. He saw the railroad and the telegraph come. He enjoyed the social graces of old Nashville and he witnessed the tragic features of the Civil War and Reconstruction period. As a young man he knew Andrew Jackson, as an old man he knew Theodore Roosevelt.

Lindsley's long and varied career offers a splendid opportunity to the historian

was printed in the *Telegraph and Texas Register,* October 26, 1835, and had already aroused a vigorous protest two weeks before November 11.

These defects do not, however, destroy the inherent value of the work as a whole. Its real significance lies in the fact that it brings together in easily accessible form all available Houston documents from both public and private collections, and thus provides a more adequate basis for the scholarly biography which one hopes will some day be written. A distinctive contribution has been made, also, in the discovery of hitherto unknown materials which throw new light on some of the obscure phases of Houston's career. Especially notable are the articles which he published in the *Arkansas Gazette* in 1830 concerning Indian affairs, and the correspondence between him and James Prentiss in 1832 concerning the interests of New York speculators in Texas lands. For this volume, alone, the student of Southwestern history must acknowledge a debt of gratitude to the editors and to the University of Texas for undertaking the enterprise. When the entire work is completed, it will unquestionably become not only an indispensable documentary collection for the study of Houston and of Texas, but also an essential source for the undertaking of many other aspects of American history during the first half of the nineteenth century.

Vanderbilt University WILLIAM C. BINKLEY

John Berrien Lindsley: Educator, Physician, Social Philosopher. By John Edwin Windrow. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938. Pp. xiii, 240. Illustrations, appendixes, bibliography. $4.00.)

John Berrien Lindsley was one of Tennessee's most gifted and versatile educators. As a physician, geologist, university president, minister of the gospel, champion of education and public health, European traveler and public speaker, essayist and editor, he led a useful, interesting, and occasionally dramatic life. It was through his leadership that Nashville became an important medical center in the Old and New South. He was instrumental in securing funds for the establishment of George Peabody College, an institution that has given valuable service to the cause of Southern education. In the period after the Civil War his name appears prominently in the campaign to make Tennessee public health conscious, and Nashville's conquest of the cholera peril was the result primarily of his insistence that the city develop a more adequate system of sanitation. Lindsley's life spanned three quarters of the nineteenth century, "a period of stark reality and tragedy" (p. viii). He came face to face with slavery. He saw the railroad and the telegraph come. He enjoyed the social graces of old Nashville and he witnessed the tragic features of the Civil War and Reconstruction period. As a young man he knew Andrew Jackson, as an old man he knew Theodore Roosevelt.

Lindsley's long and varied career offers a splendid opportunity to the historian

but apparently Mr. Windrow has not taken full advantage of it. His biography does not do justice either to himself or to Lindsley. The book is poorly organized and any attempt at finesse is destroyed by the fact that nearly one fourth of the 163 pages of narrative consists of quotations. Many of these are of doubtful value and a few seem to be almost entirely irrelevant. An example is the quotation on pages 4-5 which describes George Washington. On pages 15-16 an entire letter is quoted but only one brief line at the close of the letter has any direct relationship to the text at that point. It seems unnecessary to quote R. E. Lee's letter to his son Custis (p. 61). One doubts the necessity of quoting Philip Lindsley's 1844 plan for a medical school in Nashville (p. 32) because the plan never went into effect. A reference and a summary would have been sufficient. The long quotation on pages 29-30 is inserted at the wrong place and breaks the continuity of thought. This quotation is puzzling in another respect. It appears to be *one* excerpt and yet different sources are given for the various paragraphs, and quotations within the quotation add to the bewilderment of the reader. There are many other long quotations that should have been digested and worked into a freely flowing narrative.

Several passages show a lack of careful proofreading. For example, on page 27 Mr. Windrow uses a statement by James Phelan but gives L. S. Merriam's *Higher Education in Tennessee* as the source without making it clear that Merriam is quoting Phelan. On page 5 the paragraph beginning "The Lindsleys, who were among the earliest settlers of the New Haven colony," has been made vague either by the omission of important data or the use of incorrect dates. Careful proofreading would have improved the footnotes although a rather unsatisfactory technique has been followed throughout the book.

A study of the appendixes causes one to question the author's thoroughness in the use of his sources. It would seem that the 31 Lindsley publications listed on pages 167-71 and the 225 unpublished editorials on almost as many different topics listed on pages 171-74 could have been used to greater advantage.

With these weaknesses pointed out, it should be said that the book contains hitherto unpublished source material of value to Tennessee historians and that certain sections of the study are interesting and informative. In Chapter V, which describes Lindsley's campaign for public health education, Mr. Windrow has brought together some very interesting facts. William Walker enthusiasts will be attracted by the cycle of Walker letters included in Appendix C and the social historian will be interested in Lindsley's record of his readings as recorded in Appendix F.

The book is attractively bound and a facsimile of Lindsley's signature on the cover adds a unique touch. The illustrations are well chosen. There is a useful, if not complete, index.

Transylvania College F. GARVIN DAVENPORT

Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1831-1857. Volumes I and II. Edited by Dwight L. Dumond. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938. Pp. xxxvi, xiii, 1189. Illustrations. $10.00.)

Students of American history owe a debt of gratitude to Professors Dwight L. Dumond and Gilbert H. Barnes for their contributions to the history of the antislavery movement. Professor Barnes' scholarly book, *The Antislavery Impulse,* completely upset the orthodox version of the abolition crusade and quite neatly disposed of Garrison as the leader of the abolitionists. He most convincingly replaced the furious personality of Garrison with the quiet, evenly poised Theodore Dwight Weld. He showed that while Garrison and his small group of followers were essentially anarchistic, refusing to participate in political movements, Weld, leading the great hosts of abolitionists, was nearly always active in politics. Indeed the Weld group of abolitionists not infrequently held the balance of power. Soon after the publication of *The Antislavery Impulse,* Dumond and Barnes as joint editors brought out the Weld-Grimké letters on which Barnes had based so much of his work. In the fall of 1938 Professor Dumond extended the horizon of knowledge by the publication of the letters of another great antislavery leader, James G. Birney.

These letters fit into the Weld-Grimké picture perfectly, for they introduce us more fully to many characters who but dimly appeared in that correspondence and to others who did not appear at all. They also, as might well be suspected, show Birney to have been a more able and more important leader in the antislavery movement than has been heretofore realized.

Perhaps the fact that Birney was a Southerner and had been a slaveholder added to his influence in that it would appear always that he could speak with authority about slavery. For several years he was a practicing lawyer and planter at Huntsville, Alabama. In 1831 he became an agent of the American Colonization Society and as such was profoundly opposed to the doctrines of the radical abolitionists. Within a short while, however, he became converted to their point of view and during the remainder of his life he advocated without ceasing immediate and uncompensated emancipation of the slaves. Birney even more than Weld was responsible for the abolitionist participation in politics. It will be recalled that Birney was the presidential nominee of the Liberty party in 1844 when that party threw its weight against Henry Clay and prevented him from carrying the state of New York and thus from becoming president.

Professor Dumond has performed his editorial task with precision and with a wide knowledge of men and measures. However, it seems to the reviewer—from the editor's introduction—that his conception of the slavery controversy is lacking in scope and in objectivity. He seems to be carried away with the profound sincerity and deeply religious nature of Birney and his abolitionist colleagues; indeed, one feels that the editor has become a member of the Weld-Grimké-Tappan-Finney Holy Band. He accepts Birney's opinion that the Ameri-

can Colonization Society was a futility without considering the possibility that it might have been the abolitionist attack that made it so. He overlooks as did Birney the probability that the South would have freed its slaves in due time had it been permitted to work out its problems. He either overlooks or deliberately rejects recent historical literature which seems to show that slavery had reached its zenith of power and territorial limits, and that by soil exhaustion its economic foundations were rapidly crumbling before 1860. He ignores the opinion of political leaders like Webster, Douglas, and Clay that slavery could not be further extended. Indeed, the editor seems to have completely failed to comprehend the Southern situation with reference to slavery. By implication he apparently accepts the abolitionist doctrine—so forcefully demonstrated by John Brown—that only the shedding of blood could bring the remission of sins. It is quite apparent that Professor Dumond has never analyzed the propaganda literature of the abolitionists and its profound impact upon public opinion in the North and in the South. He is in error when he says that abolition literature was not read in the South; a careful examination of Southern newspapers, 1831-1860, can leave no doubt that the Southern public was well aware of what was being said about it in the North. It was in reply to this propaganda that the South developed its well-known defense of slavery on Biblical, social, and economic grounds.

Vanderbilt University FRANK L. OWSLEY

The Other Half of Old New Orleans. Sketches of Characters and Incidents from the Recorder's Court of New Orleans in the Eighteen Forties as Reported in the Picayune. Collected and edited by E. Merton Coulter. (University, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1939. Pp. viii, 108. Illustrations. $2.00.)

This whimsical and altogether charming little book is made up of sketches selected from the reports of the trials in the Recorder's Court of New Orleans published in the New Orleans *Picayune* during the years 1840-1842. The identity of the newspaper reporter who wrote them is uncertain, but there are reasons to believe that it was George W. Kendall. Certainly the author was a man of education with a keen sense of humor and a remarkable capacity for close observation.

The little volume is divided into seven sections, each headed by an illustration and containing from four to more than a dozen sketches. With rare wit the author depicts the strange characters that appeared in court for trial. These included wild Irish rivermen, brawny Scots, and huge Dutch or German laborers as well as many others mostly brought in for being drunk and disorderly or involved in petty rows and squabbles. The writer shows great skill in his use of the various dialects of this motley crew and an even greater gift in his use of

can Colonization Society was a futility without considering the possibility that it might have been the abolitionist attack that made it so. He overlooks as did Birney the probability that the South would have freed its slaves in due time had it been permitted to work out its problems. He either overlooks or deliberately rejects recent historical literature which seems to show that slavery had reached its zenith of power and territorial limits, and that by soil exhaustion its economic foundations were rapidly crumbling before 1860. He ignores the opinion of political leaders like Webster, Douglas, and Clay that slavery could not be further extended. Indeed, the editor seems to have completely failed to comprehend the Southern situation with reference to slavery. By implication he apparently accepts the abolitionist doctrine—so forcefully demonstrated by John Brown—that only the shedding of blood could bring the remission of sins. It is quite apparent that Professor Dumond has never analyzed the propaganda literature of the abolitionists and its profound impact upon public opinion in the North and in the South. He is in error when he says that abolition literature was not read in the South; a careful examination of Southern newspapers, 1831-1860, can leave no doubt that the Southern public was well aware of what was being said about it in the North. It was in reply to this propaganda that the South developed its well-known defense of slavery on Biblical, social, and economic grounds.

Vanderbilt University FRANK L. OWSLEY

The Other Half of Old New Orleans. Sketches of Characters and Incidents from the Recorder's Court of New Orleans in the Eighteen Forties as Reported in the Picayune. Collected and edited by E. Merton Coulter. (University, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1939. Pp. viii, 108. Illustrations. $2.00.)

This whimsical and altogether charming little book is made up of sketches selected from the reports of the trials in the Recorder's Court of New Orleans published in the New Orleans *Picayune* during the years 1840-1842. The identity of the newspaper reporter who wrote them is uncertain, but there are reasons to believe that it was George W. Kendall. Certainly the author was a man of education with a keen sense of humor and a remarkable capacity for close observation.

The little volume is divided into seven sections, each headed by an illustration and containing from four to more than a dozen sketches. With rare wit the author depicts the strange characters that appeared in court for trial. These included wild Irish rivermen, brawny Scots, and huge Dutch or German laborers as well as many others mostly brought in for being drunk and disorderly or involved in petty rows and squabbles. The writer shows great skill in his use of the various dialects of this motley crew and an even greater gift in his use of

simile. A certain Scot had a voice "as musical as a Scotch fiddle, a nose as variegated with red and blue spots as a Highlander's kilt, and beard as strong as the furze of a thistle." Another individual is described as an "anti-soap society man . . . dirty as a dredging machine, and brown as a coffee mill." Still another "looked like a long used, badly bound edition of Essays on Intemperance." Many references are made to political matters, especially to the presidential election of 1840. Behind the light, humorous scene one also gets a glimpse of "how the other half lived" in this city which was in the early forties the crossroads of the Western world and one of the most interesting spots in all America.

The little volume is not only very entertaining but also has a real historical value. The editor will have the sincere thanks of many readers for making available to them such an amusing, and at the same time so revealing, a little book.

University of Oklahoma EDWARD EVERETT DALE

Slave Insurrections in the United States, 1800-1865. By Joseph Cephas Carroll. (Boston: Chapman & Grimes, Inc., 1938. Pp. 229. Bibliography. $2.00.)

In a well-documented study of slave unrest, Dr. Carroll takes issue with those who would revive the ante-bellum thesis of the slave's docility and childlike dependence on his master. From an interminable sequence of slave insurrections and plots which cover almost every year of the Middle Period, the author indicates some of that individuality and capacity for leadership which inhered in many of the anonymous mass of slaves whose identities were submerged beneath the guise of valuable chattel. The desire for liberty manifested itself in recurrent slave ship mutinies along the Middle Passage, in the colonial plots sometimes hatched with indentured white servants, and in outbreaks, North as well as South, wherever slavery existed. Extraneous events such as the American Revolution, the struggle of Toussaint L'Ouverture, the War of 1812, and finally the Civil War itself created an atmosphere conducive to slave revolts which were occasionally organized across state lines. Sometimes white men, such as George Boxley of Spotsylvania, came forward as precursors of John Brown to spur the slave to revolt. These recurrent outbreaks and rumors of insurrection undoubtedly created a large element of insecurity in the Old South.

Studies of this type must be prefaced with several fundamental cautions. Too much of the evidence rests upon testimony taken under torture for its reliability to go unchallenged. The "faithful slave," who so frequently acted as informer, was subject to the incentive of financial reward, if not freedom itself, for his revelations. The tremendous variations in the reports of identical slave plots given in the contemporary press—which remains the leading source—suggests the possible margin of error. In one instance, at least, the details varied sufficiently for the author to report twice the same insurrection plot—that of the bor-

simile. A certain Scot had a voice "as musical as a Scotch fiddle, a nose as variegated with red and blue spots as a Highlander's kilt, and beard as strong as the furze of a thistle." Another individual is described as an "anti-soap society man . . . dirty as a dredging machine, and brown as a coffee mill." Still another "looked like a long used, badly bound edition of Essays on Intemperance." Many references are made to political matters, especially to the presidential election of 1840. Behind the light, humorous scene one also gets a glimpse of "how the other half lived" in this city which was in the early forties the crossroads of the Western world and one of the most interesting spots in all America.

The little volume is not only very entertaining but also has a real historical value. The editor will have the sincere thanks of many readers for making available to them such an amusing, and at the same time so revealing, a little book.

University of Oklahoma EDWARD EVERETT DALE

Slave Insurrections in the United States, 1800-1865. By Joseph Cephas Carroll. (Boston: Chapman & Grimes, Inc., 1938. Pp. 229. Bibliography. $2.00.)

In a well-documented study of slave unrest, Dr. Carroll takes issue with those who would revive the ante-bellum thesis of the slave's docility and childlike dependence on his master. From an interminable sequence of slave insurrections and plots which cover almost every year of the Middle Period, the author indicates some of that individuality and capacity for leadership which inhered in many of the anonymous mass of slaves whose identities were submerged beneath the guise of valuable chattel. The desire for liberty manifested itself in recurrent slave ship mutinies along the Middle Passage, in the colonial plots sometimes hatched with indentured white servants, and in outbreaks, North as well as South, wherever slavery existed. Extraneous events such as the American Revolution, the struggle of Toussaint L'Ouverture, the War of 1812, and finally the Civil War itself created an atmosphere conducive to slave revolts which were occasionally organized across state lines. Sometimes white men, such as George Boxley of Spotsylvania, came forward as precursors of John Brown to spur the slave to revolt. These recurrent outbreaks and rumors of insurrection undoubtedly created a large element of insecurity in the Old South.

Studies of this type must be prefaced with several fundamental cautions. Too much of the evidence rests upon testimony taken under torture for its reliability to go unchallenged. The "faithful slave," who so frequently acted as informer, was subject to the incentive of financial reward, if not freedom itself, for his revelations. The tremendous variations in the reports of identical slave plots given in the contemporary press—which remains the leading source—suggests the possible margin of error. In one instance, at least, the details varied sufficiently for the author to report twice the same insurrection plot—that of the bor-

der states in 1856 (pp. 191, 192). Here, again, the entire incident is open to question as to whether it was a gigantic slave plot or an example of mob psychology pervading the entire plantation area, with dubious evidence obtained under duress.

The section on slave insurrections during the Civil War is less satisfactorily done than the more thorough, early chapters. The reviewer cannot accept Dr. Carroll's statement that "in 1862 [evidently 1863] a general insurrection of Negroes was planned" by high Federal officers (p. 206) solely on the evidence of a letter by Augustus S. Montgomery of May 12, 1863, which was addressed to Union officers and proposed a large-scale insurrection. Since Montgomery remains unidentified, there is an alternate inference that the letter may possibly be that of a crank rather than that of an influential citizen. One of the more serious sins of omission is the failure to mention the insurrectionary situation in Mississippi during 1863 and again in 1864 when Yazoo City was burned by slaves. Despite these shortcomings, the book is an important pioneer study of slave unrest and furnishes an excellent corrective to romanticist theories.

De Paul University HARVEY WISH

The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism. By Ray Allen Billington. (New York: Macmillan Company, 1938. Pp. xi, 514. Bibliography, illustrations, maps. $5.00.)

This is a timely book, dealing with a period of religious and false propaganda, one which is unique in American history. Intolerance and bigotry have not always been confined to European states. In America for several decades there were steady, systematic attempts by organized Protestant groups to exterminate Catholicism.

The title "Crusade" is here used in the modern sense, yet frequent passages are found in which voice and pen were abandoned and the sword seized. In the heat of controversy and rabidness of self-belief, blows were struck, and guns, cannon, and the torch used by both sides. The Kensington and Philadelphia riots of 1844 and the Bedini riots in 1853 are examples of the bloody and destructive clashes pictured.

The author seemingly has three main objectives: first, to show the extensive active persecutions of the Catholic faith by various Protestant churches, individually and collectively; second, to cite some of the better known anti-Catholic works of the period; and third, to discuss the various aspects of nativism.

The first objective, that of actual adverse propaganda and active persecution, is well done. Given less space than the third objective, it supplies the title. The bibliography as the author states, is not exhaustive. The reviewer notes that it is largely lacking in those works of an anti-Catholic nature which he has found in private and institutional libraries of the South, and also in those popular novels in which the villains were always Catholics or members of Catholic orders.

der states in 1856 (pp. 191, 192). Here, again, the entire incident is open to question as to whether it was a gigantic slave plot or an example of mob psychology pervading the entire plantation area, with dubious evidence obtained under duress.

The section on slave insurrections during the Civil War is less satisfactorily done than the more thorough, early chapters. The reviewer cannot accept Dr. Carroll's statement that "in 1862 [evidently 1863] a general insurrection of Negroes was planned" by high Federal officers (p. 206) solely on the evidence of a letter by Augustus S. Montgomery of May 12, 1863, which was addressed to Union officers and proposed a large-scale insurrection. Since Montgomery remains unidentified, there is an alternate inference that the letter may possibly be that of a crank rather than that of an influential citizen. One of the more serious sins of omission is the failure to mention the insurrectionary situation in Mississippi during 1863 and again in 1864 when Yazoo City was burned by slaves. Despite these shortcomings, the book is an important pioneer study of slave unrest and furnishes an excellent corrective to romanticist theories.

De Paul University HARVEY WISH

The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism. By Ray Allen Billington. (New York: Macmillan Company, 1938. Pp. xi, 514. Bibliography, illustrations, maps. $5.00.)

This is a timely book, dealing with a period of religious and false propaganda, one which is unique in American history. Intolerance and bigotry have not always been confined to European states. In America for several decades there were steady, systematic attempts by organized Protestant groups to exterminate Catholicism.

The title "Crusade" is here used in the modern sense, yet frequent passages are found in which voice and pen were abandoned and the sword seized. In the heat of controversy and rabidness of self-belief, blows were struck, and guns, cannon, and the torch used by both sides. The Kensington and Philadelphia riots of 1844 and the Bedini riots in 1853 are examples of the bloody and destructive clashes pictured.

The author seemingly has three main objectives: first, to show the extensive active persecutions of the Catholic faith by various Protestant churches, individually and collectively; second, to cite some of the better known anti-Catholic works of the period; and third, to discuss the various aspects of nativism.

The first objective, that of actual adverse propaganda and active persecution, is well done. Given less space than the third objective, it supplies the title. The bibliography as the author states, is not exhaustive. The reviewer notes that it is largely lacking in those works of an anti-Catholic nature which he has found in private and institutional libraries of the South, and also in those popular novels in which the villains were always Catholics or members of Catholic orders.

In the treatment of the third objective the reviewer feels that the author has committed a few errors of fact and of interpretation. "Nativism" is used very frequently as synonymous with "anti-Catholicism." This is not the best historical or dictionary usage. On page 36 this very categorical statement is made, "Fundamentally the aliens were opposed because they were Catholic rather than because they were paupers or criminals." Again he speaks (p. 174) of the Presbyterian church as being "launched on the road to nativism" when a general assembly in 1835 condemned Catholic education of Protestant children.

It is natural that this concept of nativism would lead to a distorted discussion of the Know-Nothing movement. Von Holst, Channing, T. C. Smith, and Rhodes are cited as giving a "traditional interpretation" that the party's growth can be explained in terms of slavery. These should not be interpreted as ignoring the importance of the anti-Catholic and the antiforeign immigration movements. Dr. Billington's explanation of the American party is slavery plus the "Protestant Crusade," thus minimizing and ignoring the third and very vital cause, alarm, fear, and hatred of the political and social evils resulting from the hordes of invading immigrants.

By stating (p. 386) that "the motive behind the whole Know-Nothing movement was hatred of Catholicism," and (p. 387) that "only one force held members of the Know-Nothing party together, and that was their hatred for the Catholic church," the fact is ignored that the American party in several Southern states, notably Louisiana and Maryland, was largely composed of faithful Catholics. In Louisiana rabid Protestant lodges were disbanded. Until the Democratic press and the Hierarchy marshaled their forces of misinterpretation and denunciation, many Catholics supported the party throughout the United States.

Other minor errors mar this portion of the work. Credence given to Charles Gayarré's *Address to the People of Louisiana on the State of the Parties,* the work of an embittered and disappointed officeseeker, results in the erroneous statement that Louisiana withdrew from the national party and maintained a separate organization (p. 422). Again (p. 429), the assertion is made that the American party in 1855 devoted its campaign to "save the union pleas" and not to the American platform. This was certainly not true in the Southern states. The treatment of the organization and ritual of the party is somewhat faulty as evidenced by the statement (p. 384) that the ritual of the organization was composed of two degrees, omitting the third or Union degree.

The appendix contains the constitutions of several Protestant societies as well as an extensive nativistic bibliography. The text includes seven election maps and some nineteen illustrations taken from contemporary anti-Catholic sources. Though slightly pro-Catholic, it is very readable and informative. Scholars in this field will welcome its appearance.

Centenary College of Louisiana W. DARRELL OVERDYKE

Secession and Restoration of Louisiana. By Willie Malvin Caskey, with foreword by Frank Lawrence Owsley. (University, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1938. Pp. xii, 318. Maps, bibliography. $3.50.)

A careful study of the early period of reconstruction in Louisiana is long overdue. The work by John R. Ficklen, published posthumously in 1910, can in no way be regarded as a finished piece of work. As Professor Frank L. Owsley states in the preface to this new study, that fact may be fortunate as some material, inaccessible to earlier scholars, has recently become available.

The present volume, after first setting the stage by a brief account of the presidential election of 1860 and of the secession of Louisiana, traces the story of reconstruction from Butler's clumsy, ruthless beginnings through the overthrow of presidential restoration by President Johnson. This first period in the long drawn-out drama in Louisiana constitutes a logical unit.

Dr. Caskey, with considerable logic, regards this period as one of reorganization rather than of reconstruction. He properly interprets the presidential vote of 1860 in this state as morally a vote for the Union, in which secession was not the issue. In the second chapter he insists upon the point that Louisiana was definitely with the Confederacy, once the issue of secession was joined, and shows that there was little real Union sentiment. Chapter VI brings out clearly the extravagance, waste, and disorder in the constitutional convention of 1864 before the Negro had the ballot, showing conclusively that the shameless corruption in the legislatures of a later date cannot be ascribed wholly to that race.

The volume reflects thorough research with access to manuscript and documentary materials, as well as to memoirs, monographs, and the usual printed sources. The author has made especially faithful search through the newspapers of the state, though one could wish that he had given more generous excerpts from this spicy source, either in the text or in the notes.

The author assumes from his readers too great conversance with Louisiana history; he frequently refers to persons, events, or laws without explaining them. The allusion to an act as No. 12 (p. 191), though no exact explanation of the purport of the statute is offered either in text or notes, is a case in point. Noell and Governor Winston are introduced without explanation (Chap. I, n. 8, p. 72). Sometimes the tendency to reduce details leads to too much elision. On page 212 the author states that there is evidence of collusion between the radicals in Congress and a few Louisianians and then contents himself with bare reference, where one might logically look for submission of proof. The absence of cross references is conspicuous. On the other hand, there is considerable minor repetition; facts which have already appeared in the text are restated in the notes or vice versa.

There are some lapses from orthodox style in misplaced clauses. A few cases of careless proofreading occur, as where "senators to the lower house of the

legislature" are to be elected (p. 174), and where 1864 appears although 1861 must be intended (p. 38). One could wish for a somewhat more vivid style in handling the July riot described in Chapter X.

Scattered through the text are nine pen and ink maps to show the way in which the citizens voted on various issues (except Map No. 5, which shows the parishes exempted from Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation). They are distinctly helpful, though the reviewer must point out a discrepancy in Map No. 1. In the text it is stated that Bell carried two parishes in the northern part of the state, Ouachita and Madison, whereas the map indicates Ouachita and Tensas.

On the whole here is a young writer whose work his fellow craftsmen will note. It is a pleasure to welcome another volume from the Louisiana State University Press, which is maintaining a high standard of printing and workmanship.

Goucher College ELLA LONN

Flight into Oblivion. By A. J. Hanna. (Richmond: Johnson Publishing Company, 1938. Pp. xiii, 306. Maps, illustrations, bibliography. $2.75.)

Flight into Oblivion: A questionable, "Gone with the Wind" title, chosen for a volume which sketches the fortunes of the Confederate President and his cabinet as they fled southward after the evacuation of Richmond toward the southwest and Texas—a flight later turned into a man-hunt as each individual sought escape from the threatened firing squad or the rope. A long-neglected three months of American history; the last thrilling, dramatic chapter in the epic of the War for Southern Independence. It is the story of the final crumbling of Confederate civil authority, of the disintegration of the funds of the Confederate treasury department, of the thirty-day flight of a President without a country, of the adventures of his official family before their capture or escape.

The volume has much to commend it. The research on the whole has evidently been extensively and carefully accomplished. Much explanatory material has been included, in some cases extending beyond the needs of the narrative. The organization is simple and logical. The evacuation of Richmond is colorfully described and in panoramic succession Danville, Greensboro, and Charlotte have their brief day as capital of a disintegrating Confederate States of America. The flight of the presidential party is graphically described and at Irwinville, Georgia, Jefferson Davis is captured. Then the fortunes of five men are followed, Judah P. Benjamin, Robert Toombs, George Davis, John C. Breckinridge, and Colonel John T. Wood, Confederate naval officer and aide to President Davis, as flight leads them down the east or west coast of Florida or to New Orleans as they execute their escape to Cuba and foreign exile. The book is attractive in format and binding, fifty-seven black and white illustrations lend atmosphere, and fifteen page-size maps illustrate routes taken, adding materially to the value of the work. A well-organized bibliography and index complete the volume.

legislature" are to be elected (p. 174), and where 1864 appears although 1861 must be intended (p. 38). One could wish for a somewhat more vivid style in handling the July riot described in Chapter X.

Scattered through the text are nine pen and ink maps to show the way in which the citizens voted on various issues (except Map No. 5, which shows the parishes exempted from Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation). They are distinctly helpful, though the reviewer must point out a discrepancy in Map No. 1. In the text it is stated that Bell carried two parishes in the northern part of the state, Ouachita and Madison, whereas the map indicates Ouachita and Tensas.

On the whole here is a young writer whose work his fellow craftsmen will note. It is a pleasure to welcome another volume from the Louisiana State University Press, which is maintaining a high standard of printing and workmanship.

Goucher College ELLA LONN

Flight into Oblivion. By A. J. Hanna. (Richmond: Johnson Publishing Company, 1938. Pp. xiii, 306. Maps, illustrations, bibliography. $2.75.)

Flight into Oblivion: A questionable, "Gone with the Wind" title, chosen for a volume which sketches the fortunes of the Confederate President and his cabinet as they fled southward after the evacuation of Richmond toward the southwest and Texas—a flight later turned into a man-hunt as each individual sought escape from the threatened firing squad or the rope. A long-neglected three months of American history; the last thrilling, dramatic chapter in the epic of the War for Southern Independence. It is the story of the final crumbling of Confederate civil authority, of the disintegration of the funds of the Confederate treasury department, of the thirty-day flight of a President without a country, of the adventures of his official family before their capture or escape.

The volume has much to commend it. The research on the whole has evidently been extensively and carefully accomplished. Much explanatory material has been included, in some cases extending beyond the needs of the narrative. The organization is simple and logical. The evacuation of Richmond is colorfully described and in panoramic succession Danville, Greensboro, and Charlotte have their brief day as capital of a disintegrating Confederate States of America. The flight of the presidential party is graphically described and at Irwinville, Georgia, Jefferson Davis is captured. Then the fortunes of five men are followed, Judah P. Benjamin, Robert Toombs, George Davis, John C. Breckinridge, and Colonel John T. Wood, Confederate naval officer and aide to President Davis, as flight leads them down the east or west coast of Florida or to New Orleans as they execute their escape to Cuba and foreign exile. The book is attractive in format and binding, fifty-seven black and white illustrations lend atmosphere, and fifteen page-size maps illustrate routes taken, adding materially to the value of the work. A well-organized bibliography and index complete the volume.

Professor Hanna has evidently intended to straddle the book trade by attempting to make the work attractive to both the lay reader and the erudite historian. That the former has been well pleased is evident because of the volume's recent recommendation by the Book-of-the-Month Club. Though staying within the limitations of the sources, the tone of the work seems to indicate at times to the reviewer that the author cannot forget that his forbears have been citizens these hundred years of Florida and of the South. While attempting to settle the perplexing mystery of the disappearance of the Confederate treasure, the final disposition of the $86,000 "paid to James A. Semple, a bonded officer of the Navy," is not disclosed. The style of the first part of the volume might be termed pleonastic, perhaps for the benefit of adolescent readers. Several monotony-breaking, perhaps imagined descriptions, not quoted from sources, lend a picturesque color to the narrative. Two illustrations will serve. "No sound greeted them other than the swishing of the pines in the light breeze, the hum of the insects, the grunt of 'razor-back' hogs, the occasional 'bob-white' of a distant quail, and the song of the meadowlark" (p. 130-31). And again, "Probably they were not conscious of the ominous hoot of the owls, the eerie cry of the limpkins, the monotonous croak of frogs, or even the lusty, ground-shaking bellow of the bull alligators" (p. 147). And finally, in listing the contents of Davis' trunk and two chests, why not admit that, instead of "eight linen shirts," the citation read "eight linen shirts (dirty)" (*Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies,* Ser. I, Vol. XLII, Pt. III, 653).

Louisiana State University EDWIN ADAMS DAVIS

35,000 Days in Texas: A History of the Dallas News and Its Forbears. By Sam Acheson. (New York: Macmillan Company, 1938. Pp. xv, 337. Illustrations. $2.50.)

Sam Acheson, editorial writer for the Dallas *Morning News* and biographer of Joe Bailey, must have an affinity for debatable subjects because, in presenting *35,000 Days in Texas,* he has again produced a controversial biography. The subtitle explains that it is the history of the Dallas *Morning News* and its forbears—and although the work deals with a corporate instead of a real personality, it is nonetheless biographical. The book tells a story often repeated in America—the story of success.

It is the history of a journalistic endeavor which claims to be "the oldest business institution in Texas," humbly born in Galveston in 1842, when Texas was an infant Republic, and evolved in slightly less than a century to such a magnificence that its Dallas properties were valued at $2,725,000. This figure is convincing testimony of its success as a publishing enterprise. There can be no doubt that historically and at present, the Dallas *Morning News* holds high rank in the columns of American journalism. The explanation of this phenom-

Professor Hanna has evidently intended to straddle the book trade by attempting to make the work attractive to both the lay reader and the erudite historian. That the former has been well pleased is evident because of the volume's recent recommendation by the Book-of-the-Month Club. Though staying within the limitations of the sources, the tone of the work seems to indicate at times to the reviewer that the author cannot forget that his forbears have been citizens these hundred years of Florida and of the South. While attempting to settle the perplexing mystery of the disappearance of the Confederate treasure, the final disposition of the $86,000 "paid to James A. Semple, a bonded officer of the Navy," is not disclosed. The style of the first part of the volume might be termed pleonastic, perhaps for the benefit of adolescent readers. Several monotony-breaking, perhaps imagined descriptions, not quoted from sources, lend a picturesque color to the narrative. Two illustrations will serve. "No sound greeted them other than the swishing of the pines in the light breeze, the hum of the insects, the grunt of 'razor-back' hogs, the occasional 'bob-white' of a distant quail, and the song of the meadowlark" (p. 130-31). And again, "Probably they were not conscious of the ominous hoot of the owls, the eerie cry of the limpkins, the monotonous croak of frogs, or even the lusty, ground-shaking bellow of the bull alligators" (p. 147). And finally, in listing the contents of Davis' trunk and two chests, why not admit that, instead of "eight linen shirts," the citation read "eight linen shirts (dirty)" (*Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies,* Ser. I, Vol. XLII, Pt. III, 653).

Louisiana State University EDWIN ADAMS DAVIS

35,000 Days in Texas: A History of the Dallas News and Its Forbears. By Sam Acheson. (New York: Macmillan Company, 1938. Pp. xv, 337. Illustrations. $2.50.)

Sam Acheson, editorial writer for the Dallas *Morning News* and biographer of Joe Bailey, must have an affinity for debatable subjects because, in presenting *35,000 Days in Texas,* he has again produced a controversial biography. The subtitle explains that it is the history of the Dallas *Morning News* and its forbears—and although the work deals with a corporate instead of a real personality, it is nonetheless biographical. The book tells a story often repeated in America—the story of success.

It is the history of a journalistic endeavor which claims to be "the oldest business institution in Texas," humbly born in Galveston in 1842, when Texas was an infant Republic, and evolved in slightly less than a century to such a magnificence that its Dallas properties were valued at $2,725,000. This figure is convincing testimony of its success as a publishing enterprise. There can be no doubt that historically and at present, the Dallas *Morning News* holds high rank in the columns of American journalism. The explanation of this phenom-

enon may be the confidence of its readers in its reporting, if not in its editorial pages, for its editorial convictions have frequently been at odds with the Texan electorate.

With a fine style Mr. Acheson shows the reader the stage upon which the drama of the *News* has been enacted. It is a full, big, and broad Texas stage, and upon its curtained background are the multiplicity of incidents, activities, and personalities which tend to make the history of the paper a miniature history of Texas.

The first third of the narrative tells of the founding and growth of the Galveston *Daily News*, while the remainder details more fully the activities of the Dallas *Morning News*, struck off from the parent stem in 1885 to become thereby one of the first attempts at "chain journalism" in America.

The book is doubly interesting because it is an authorized history of the Dallas *News*. Mr. Acheson is not unsympathetic with all that the *News* has been and now is, and he is much concerned with describing the independent character of the paper. The management has been always its own supreme arbiter in political, economic, and moral areas, accepting no judgment as superior to its own—a sovereign power within itself—restrained only by the laws of libel. Mr. Acheson says the result has been able, fearless, and conscientious journalism. Yet somehow the reader has not been conducted backstage. Definitely no "state" secrets as to the ultimate "whys" of policy are revealed. The explanations of editorial changes in policy are stated in terms of changes in conditions; consequently, the forces and philosophy motivating the management are not developed, for freedom from restraint might have produced opposites; independence does not necessarily yield any given quantity of anything. Surely extravagant praise might be offered for the paper's fearless independence, but just as surely it has been called "Scribe within the temple of Big Business."

The subject of the Dallas *News* (including its forbears) is axiomatically controversial material in Texas because for nearly a century it has had to react to every issue that has shaped itself in the state. The *News*, therefore, has frequently been a storm center giving and receiving abuse; it has and has always had its advocates; and, on the other hand, there remain thousands of persons who characterize the paper as "the Scarlet Woman of Texas Journalism." As an avowed conserver of civilization, the paper has frequently exhibited a contradictory personality and yet there are those who find a unity in the paper's activities—a close integration of its character with the business man's civilization.

With its traditional editorial anonymity the paper alternately has damned and demanded paternalism in government; been a denouncer of jingoism and demanded a wide imperialism, explained as a broader humanitarianism; proclaimed free silver and apostatized to gold; supported and condemned Baileyism, Fergusonism, and Bryanism.

For decades the editorial pages of the Dallas *News* have concerned themselves with the agrarian problem. A nonpolitical, unitary solution was offered—diversification; but the farmer has always been viewed as inseparably related to both bankers and business men. One farmer-reader's reply was that the *News* was generous enough to let the farmer work out his own salvation—if he could, but it resisted strenuously any ballot box backfire.

The volume presents in splendid short compass the history of the civic, industrial, and physical growth of Dallas, Texas; an account of the *Texas Almanacs;* and the story of the technical advances in typography during the life of the paper. It should be a welcomed addition to any Texana shelf and of interest to any student of American journalism.

North Texas Agricultural College — H. BAILEY CARROLL

Church-State Relationships in Education in North Carolina Since 1776. By Luther L. Gobbel. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1938. Pp. xvi, 251. Bibliography. $3.00.)

In his introduction to this book, Dean Luther A. Weigle of the Divinity School of Yale University says: "President Gobbel tells this story concretely, yet with objectivity and restraint." The story is that of church-state relationships; and President Gobbel, the teller of the story, is by temperament, training, and experience peculiarly fitted for the task of telling it. He was educated in the elementary and secondary schools of North Carolina, and was graduated from a denominational college. His sympathies are, therefore, well balanced between the two systems. As director of Religious Education for the North Carolina Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, for more than ten years, he had a fine opportunity to study the educational system of the state from both a secular and religious standpoint. He therefore brings both scholarship and experience to this study.

Perhaps there is no section of the country where church-state relationships can be studied to a better advantage or under better conditions than in North Carolina. Frequently one denomination may be in the ascendancy, and a biased system may result. But in North Carolina there are several large denominations that exercise almost equal control and therefore the system of denominational education will be rather largely in the name of the church as a whole rather than that of a particular religious group.

This study shows how and why the state assumed the task of teaching in the fields of higher education from almost the beginning of statehood. It further shows that the denominations at first patronized and even promoted the work of the University. Later, for reasons presented, the churches undertook the work of higher education on their own behalf, and withdrew their patronage to a great extent from the state system.

For decades the editorial pages of the Dallas *News* have concerned themselves with the agrarian problem. A nonpolitical, unitary solution was offered—diversification; but the farmer has always been viewed as inseparably related to both bankers and business men. One farmer-reader's reply was that the *News* was generous enough to let the farmer work out his own salvation—if he could, but it resisted strenuously any ballot box backfire.

The volume presents in splendid short compass the history of the civic, industrial, and physical growth of Dallas, Texas; an account of the *Texas Almanacs;* and the story of the technical advances in typography during the life of the paper. It should be a welcomed addition to any Texana shelf and of interest to any student of American journalism.

North Texas Agricultural College — H. BAILEY CARROLL

Church-State Relationships in Education in North Carolina Since 1776. By Luther L. Gobbel. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1938. Pp. xvi, 251. Bibliography. $3.00.)

In his introduction to this book, Dean Luther A. Weigle of the Divinity School of Yale University says: "President Gobbel tells this story concretely, yet with objectivity and restraint." The story is that of church-state relationships; and President Gobbel, the teller of the story, is by temperament, training, and experience peculiarly fitted for the task of telling it. He was educated in the elementary and secondary schools of North Carolina, and was graduated from a denominational college. His sympathies are, therefore, well balanced between the two systems. As director of Religious Education for the North Carolina Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, for more than ten years, he had a fine opportunity to study the educational system of the state from both a secular and religious standpoint. He therefore brings both scholarship and experience to this study.

Perhaps there is no section of the country where church-state relationships can be studied to a better advantage or under better conditions than in North Carolina. Frequently one denomination may be in the ascendancy, and a biased system may result. But in North Carolina there are several large denominations that exercise almost equal control and therefore the system of denominational education will be rather largely in the name of the church as a whole rather than that of a particular religious group.

This study shows how and why the state assumed the task of teaching in the fields of higher education from almost the beginning of statehood. It further shows that the denominations at first patronized and even promoted the work of the University. Later, for reasons presented, the churches undertook the work of higher education on their own behalf, and withdrew their patronage to a great extent from the state system.

Examples of conflicts and differences are given with an attempt to evaluate the causes and outcomes of such conflicts. Later chapters of the book set forth the struggle of the University of North Carolina to secure appropriations and to increase its educational standards. The crisis that arose when the state-supported and church-supported schools came into sharp antagonism is treated carefully and thoroughly, and some light is thrown upon the philosophy that underlay the whole struggle. The conflict was negligible in the field of secondary education. Here the church used its unrestricted and unstinted efforts in the attempt to secure help for the common schools. The book closes with an encouraging report of the present situation and with examples of fine co-operation between state and church supported schools. President Gobbel tells the story graphically in spite of minute details which had to be given. He shows a fine sense of discrimination in his analyses. He also shows a splendid grasp of the philosophy of education as he evaluates the various phases of this momentous struggle.

One of the most interesting features of this book is the information contained in the footnotes. Here one is furnished insight into the private opinions of distinguished men. Here we have interesting excerpts from the editorials of now forgotten publications which were once important and influential in the state. Personalities long forgotten again voice their opinions on once important subjects in an interesting fashion.

The author's summary of present trends is encouraging. Gone are many of the animosities that once prevailed. Co-operation is manifested between once bitter rivals. Co-operative work between church and state receives a fair trial. The spirit of friendliness prevails.

Both as a source of scholarly information and as a stimulating study, the book is of great value and interest.

Duke University H. E. SPENCE

American Caste and the Negro College. By Buell G. Gallagher, with a foreword by William H. Kilpatrick. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938. Pp. xx, 463. Bibliography, charts, appendixes. $2.50.)

The Supreme Court's recent decision in the Missouri University Case will no doubt lead Southern states to add graduate and professional instruction to their present Negro colleges. The movement gives special significance to this volume in which President Gallagher of Talladega College, Alabama, examines the function of the segregated Negro college in the South from the point of view of education as a process for changing the social order.

Caste is a negation of democracy and by its conformity, the segregated college, it is felt, has acquiesced in that negation. With some qualification the book accordingly develops the thesis that the Negro college should openly and directly do what it has admittedly been attempting to do since its foundation; namely,

make a serious effort to transform the caste system and to enable its graduates to transcend what, in their own lifetime, they may not transform. This involves a lengthy discussion of the social factors determining caste, of race attitudes, of the necessity of biracial faculties, democratic relations in the college and its community, and the nature of a functional and prophetic education. Nowhere, however, is the reader offered any suggestions nor much hope as to the mitigation of caste.

As in many of the books on educational aims and ideals, there is sometimes little clear-cut demarcation between what ought to be and what is in this world of outmoded curricula and recalcitrant folkways. Except for references to the author's experience at Talladega, the volume draws most of its materials from secondary sources. As a mordant picture of the social pressures affecting the Negro college, the volume makes distinctive contributions.

University of North Carolina RUPERT B. VANCE

Historical News and Notices

The November, 1939, issue of the *Journal* contained a compilation of "Research Projects in Southern History" which elicited much favorable comment. Believing that such a compilation, if kept up to date, will be of great practical value to historians working in the Southern field, it has been decided to publish annual supplements in each November number as long as responses warrant such procedure. Those who have studies in progress which were not included in the original list are urged to forward the necessary data to the *Journal* office not later than June 1. Several items which arrived too late to make the November, 1938, issue have been kept on file for the first supplement.

Personal

The centennial prize of $1,500 offered by the Duke University Press for "a scholarly manuscript in the field of social, literary, or artistic history of the United States" has been awarded to Clement Eaton, head of the department of history at Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania. The title of Professor Eaton's prize-winning study is "Freedom of Thought in the Old South." The judges in the competition were Arthur M. Schlesinger of Harvard University, Merle E. Curti of Columbia University, and Norman Foerster of the University of Iowa.

Professor Eaton was born at Winston-Salem, North Carolina. He received his undergraduate training at the University of North Carolina, and was awarded the doctorate in history at Harvard University in 1929. He held a Sheldon Travelling Fellowship in Europe from Harvard, and also served as tutor at that institution. Before entering upon his duties at Lafayette College, he taught history at Whitman College, Walla Walla, Washington, and at Clark University. His "Freedom of Thought in the Old South" will be published by the Duke University Press.

The third series of Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History, sponsored by the Graduate School and the Department of History of Louisiana State University, was delivered March 7-9 by Herbert A. Kellar, director of the McCormick Historical Association. The general subject, "Conditioning Factors in Southern Agriculture in the Ante-bellum Period," provided three specific themes for the lecturer: "Cultural Phases," "Technological Aspects," and "Rural Philosophy." At a dinner in his honor, Mr. Kellar discussed informally procedures and experiences in restoring a mill and slave cabin at the McCormick homestead in Virginia.

Duke University announces the following visiting staff in history for the summer session of 1939: first term, Wilfred H. Callcott of the University of South Carolina, Fletcher M. Green of the University of North Carolina, Lawrence F. Hill of Ohio State University, Walter C. Langsam of Union College, Wendell H. Stephenson of Louisiana State University; second term, Oron J. Hale of the University of Virginia, Ludwell L. Montague of Virginia Military Institute, Culver H. Smith of the University of Chattanooga.

Summer school appointments at the University of North Carolina include Frank L. Owsley of Vanderbilt University, first term; Leonard C. Helderman of Washington and Lee University, second term.

Louis B. Schmidt of Iowa State College will give graduate courses in "Foreign Relations of the United States, 1898-1939" and "History of American Agriculture" at the University of Texas during the first term of the summer session. V. Alton Moody, also of Iowa State College, will offer graduate courses in the field of the Old South during the second term.

In the summer session at the University of Missouri, Everett E. Edwards, editor of *Agricultural History,* will offer work in the history of American agriculture, and Burt J. Lowenberg of the University of South Dakota will teach courses in American history.

Other summer session appointments in the historical guild have been called to the *Journal's* attention: J. Carlisle Sitterson of the University of North Carolina to teach at the College of William and Mary; Dan H. Thomas of Temple University to teach at the University of Alabama; Harry E. Barnes to teach at the University of Kentucky; John H. Dupre of the University of Kentucky to teach at West Virginia University, second term; Chase Mooney, candidate for the doctorate at Vanderbilt University, to teach at the University of Mississippi; W. T. Jordan of Judson College to teach at John B. Stetson University; Watt Stewart of Oklahoma A. and M. College to teach at New York State College for Teachers; R. H. Wienefield of the University of South Carolina to teach at Johns Hopkins University.

Charles G. Summersell of the University of Alabama is on leave of absence during the current year for work toward the doctorate at Vanderbilt University. J. F. Ramsey, who was on leave during the fall semester for research in Paris on the French Revolution, has returned to the University of Alabama for the second semester.

Charles E. Smith and Paul G. Moorhead, of Louisiana State University, are the authors of *A Short History of the Ancient World,* a recent release of D. Appleton-Century Company.

Announcement has recently been made in Raleigh that the North Carolina

textbook commission has designated Alex M. Arnett's *The Story of North Carolina* as the official text for use in the eighth grade of the state's schools.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The committee on local arrangements has designated November 2-4 as the date for the fifth annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association. As previously announced, the Association will convene in Lexington, Kentucky.

At the regular meeting of the East Tennessee Historical Society on December 3, at Knoxville, the following officers were elected for the year 1939: Joseph A. Sharp, Knoxville, president; W. Flynn Rogers, East Tennessee State Teachers College, Mary R. Campbell, Maryville College, and John P. Brown, Chattanooga, vice-presidents; Laura E. Lutrell, Knoxville, secretary; Lucile Deaderick, Lawson McGhee Library, Knoxville, treasurer; Mary U. Rothrock, Tennessee Valley Authority, and Jennings B. Sanders, University of Tennessee, members of the executive committee. At the same meeting announcement was made of the appointment of the following editors for the annual *Publications* of the Society: Stanley J. Folmsbee, University of Tennessee, managing editor, and V. M. Queener, Maryville College, editorial associate, for 1939; and Daniel M. Robison, Vanderbilt University, and James W. Patton, Converse College, members of the board of editors for terms of three years.

The thirty-seventh annual meeting of the Florida Historical Society assembled at Daytona Beach, January 24, and at New Smyrna and St. Augustine, January 25. President Joshua Coffin Chase presided at the morning session at Daytona Beach; James D. Glunt of the University of Florida read a paper on "Florida Plantations"; T. E. Fitzgerald, Daytona Beach editor, presented "Some Historical Highlights of Volusia County"; and Philip S. May, Jacksonville attorney, followed with a paper entitled "One of the Most Fit and Discreet Men of the Territory—Zephaniah Kingsley." At the afternoon session two papers of general interest were presented: one by Howard A. Kelley of Johns Hopkins University, "A Brief Account of Randolph Caldecott," and another by William B. Goodwin of Hartford, Connecticut, "The Oldest Community Site in America—Between 874 and 983 A. D." Samuel H. Fisher of Litchfield, Connecticut, addressed the Society's annual dinner on the subject, "Why Two Connecticut Yankees Went South," an account of the background and immediate ancestry of General Edmund Kirby Smith.

On the second day of the meeting, Rev. Joseph T. Daley read a paper entitled "The Old Spanish Mission at New Smyrna Beach" at the mission ruins outside the city. Other places of historical interest in the neighborhood of New Smyrna and St. Augustine were visited, and the convention closed with a dinner at St. Augustine. Marjorie K. Rawlings spoke on "My Use of Florida History Materials," and R. A. Gray, secretary of the State of Florida, described the "Preservation of State Papers and Documents of Historical Value."

The following officers and directors were elected at the annual meeting: A. J. Hanna of Rollins College, president; Mrs. Henry Kohl, Palm Beach, first vice-president; C. Horace Curry, Quincy, second vice-president; Watt Marchman, Rollins College, corresponding secretary and librarian; Herbert A. Kahler, St. Augustine, recording secretary; Dorothy Dodd, Jacksonville, treasurer; Spessard L. Holland, Bartow, and Kathryn T. Abbey, Florida State College for Women, directors at large; C. L. Grow, University of Florida, director from the second district; E. C. Romfh, Miami, director from the fourth district.

A regional meeting of the Florida Historical Society was held at Bradenton and Sarasota, March 10-11.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

A former issue of the *Journal* (May, 1938) announced a project for a co-operative ten-volume history of the South to be sponsored jointly by the George W. Littlefield Fund for Southern History at the University of Texas and Louisiana State University, to be edited by Charles W. Ramsdell and Wendell H. Stephenson, and to be published by the presses of Louisiana State University and the University of Texas. Plans for the history have moved forward, and it is anticipated that publication may begin within two years and be completed within five. Contracts have been signed with authors whose names appear opposite the tentative titles listed below.

1. The Southern Colonies in the Seventeenth Century, 1607-1689, by Wesley F. Craven, New York University.
2. The Southern Colonies in the Eighteenth Century, 1689-1763, by Philip Davidson, Agnes Scott College.
3. The South in the American Revolution, 1763-1789, by Philip M. Hamer, The National Archives.
4. Founding the Southern System, 1789-1819, by Thomas P. Abernethy, University of Virginia.
5. The Development of Southern Sectionalism, 1819-1848, by Charles S. Sydnor, Duke University.
6. The Growth of Southern Nationalism, 1848-1861, by Avery Craven, University of Chicago.
7. The Southern Confederacy, 1861-1865, by Charles W. Ramsdell, University of Texas.
8. The South in Reconstruction, 1865-1880, by E. Merton Coulter, University of Georgia.
9. The Origins of the New South, 1880-1913, by C. Vann Woodward, University of Florida.
10. The Present South, 1913-1940, by Rupert Vance, University of North Carolina.

A revival of historical activity in Mississippi is indicated by the appearance of the first issue of *The Journal of Mississippi History* (January, 1939), a publication of the Mississippi Historical Society. The magazine is wisely planned, ably edited, and attractively printed. The editorial staff consists of William D. McCain, Mississippi Department of Archives and History, editor; John K. Bettersworth, Mississippi State College, and William B. Hamilton, Duke University, assistant editors; Alfred W. Garner, Mississippi State College, R. A. McLemore, Mississippi State Teachers College, Ross H. Moore, Millsaps College, Mary Lou Peyton, Mississippi State College for Women, Percy L. Rainwater, Historical Records Survey, Bell I. Wiley, University of Mississippi, and Wirt A. Williams, Delta State Teachers College, members of the board of editors. The inaugural issue contains three meritorious articles: "The Friendship of John Sharp Williams and Woodrow Wilson," by George C. Osborn; "John Carmichael Jenkins, Scientific Planter of the Natchez District," by Albert Garrel Seal; and "The Sources of History of the Mississippi Territory," by William B. Hamilton. The documents section includes "Mississippi Unionism: The Case of the Reverend James A. Lyon," edited by John K. Bettersworth; and the "Hugh Harris Robison Letters," edited by Weymouth T. Jordan. A creditable book review section completes the first number.

Southern Sketches Number 11 (Charlottesville, Virginia: Green Bookman, Inc., 1938, pp. 39), under the general editorship of J. D. Eggleston, embraces *George Fitzhugh, Conservative of the Old South,* by Harvey Wish. A biographical sketch of Fitzhugh introduces the subject of the brochure, but the emphasis is upon his social and political theories. The author has drawn heavily upon Fitzhugh's books, *Sociology for the South, or the Failure of Free Society* (1854), *Cannibals All! or, Slaves without Masters* (1857); his pamphlets, as *Slavery Justified* (1850); and his contributions to such magazines as *De Bow's Review.*

The *Annual Report, 1937-38,* of the Hayes Memorial Library at Fremont, Ohio, will be of interest to historical scholars working in the period from 1865 to 1900, and particularly to students of Southern history. Because of Rutherford B. Hayes' liberal attitude toward the South during his quadrennium as president and his interest in the South in the years which followed, the Hayes Papers contain significant material on many aspects of the history of the South. Attention is called to a series of letters published in the documentary section of this issue of the *Journal,* "Slater Fund Beginnings: Letters from General Agent Atticus G. Haygood to Rutherford B. Hayes," edited by Curtis W. Garrison, director of research at the Hayes Memorial Library. The Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, Columbus, Ohio, with which the Hayes Memorial is affiliated, has issued in recent years two guides to materials available in the Fremont library: *An Index and List of the Pamphlets and Periodicals Collected by Rutherford Birchard Hayes* (1935), and *An Index and List of the Letters and Papers of Rutherford Birchard Hayes* (n. d.).

Historical Papers of the Trinity College Historical Society, Series XXII, embraces *In Memoriam: William Kenneth Boyd, January 10, 1879-January 19, 1938* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1938, pp. vii, 97, frontispiece, $1.00). The addresses and compilations were presented at memorial exercises honoring the late Professor Boyd's long service at Trinity College and Duke University. To this series William T. Laprade contributed "Colleague and Friend"; Julian P. Boyd, "Teacher"; Bennett H. Branscomb, "Director of Libraries"; Robert H. Woody, "Collector—The George Washington Flowers Collection"; Robert D. W. Connor, "Historian and Promoter of Historical Studies"; and William B. Hamilton, Jr., "Bibliography of Published Writings."

The mimeographed "Proceedings of the Conference of State and Local Historical Societies held at Chicago, Illinois, December 28, 1938," includes a paper on "Southern Historical Agencies—A Program of Action," presented by C. C. Crittenden, director of the North Carolina Historical Commission.

No. 5 Check List of Kentucky Imprints, 1787-1810 (Louisville: The Historical Records Survey, 1939, pp. xxvii, 205), by Douglas C. McMurtrie and Albert H. Allen, is a volume in the American Imprints Inventory Series. A total of 379 items are listed, 328 of which are pamphlets and books and 51 of which are broadsides. Copies of 323 of the items listed have been located, distributed in 103 different collections. Kentucky imprints in the period 1811-1830 will be listed in a companion volume.

The Williamsburg Art of Cookery or, Accomplish'd Gentlewoman's Companion: Being a Collection of upwards of Five Hundred of the most Ancient & Approv'd Recipes in Virginia Cookery (Richmond: The Dietz Press, 1938, pp. 276, illustrations, bibliography), by Helen Bullock, is "a typographical Adaptation from [William] *Parks' 'The Compleat Housewife, or Accomplished Gentlewoman's Companion.'* " In keeping with the spirit of the Williamsburg Restoration, style and format suggest colonial Virginia. The type is old style Caslon, and the ornaments are mainly reproductions of those used by Parks. The compilation of favorite Virginia recipes—for soups and sauces, flesh and fish, pastries and cheese cakes, preserves and pickles, confectionery and cakes, etc., were *"collected from Books known to have been used in* Virginia *Households"*—some printed in Virginia and some in England. But *"The best Source of* Virginia *Recipes proved to be the little handwritten Books kept by early Housewives and cherished by their descendants."*

The first issue of *The Journal of Politics,* official organ of the Southern Political Science Association, made its appearance in February. The new quarterly magazine succeeds the *Proceedings* of the Association, which appeared annually, 1933-1938. Robert J. Harris of the School of Government, Louisiana State University, is the editor of the *Journal* and Manning J. Dauer of the University of Florida is the managing editor.

The East Tennessee Historical Society is inaugurating the publication of a series of "Special Studies in Tennessee History" to supplement the annual *Publications* of the Society. The first number of the Studies, "Sectionalism and Internal Improvements in Tennessee Prior to 1840," by Stanley J. Folmsbee of the University of Tennessee, will appear during the spring of 1939.

A series of eight maps illustrating various phases of the history of South Carolina has been compiled by David D. Wallace, professor of history and economics in Wofford College, and issued by Denoyer-Geppert Company. The principal maps deal with "Exploration and Settlement," "Indians," "The Colonial Period," "The Revolution," "The Plantation Era, 1785-1860," "War of Secession," "Agriculture, Manufactures, and Population," and there is also a "Physical Map of South Carolina." Because of the triangular shape of South Carolina, the compiler has been able to include a number of small inset maps covering a variety of subjects, such as Charleston Harbor, the original counties, campaigns of Marion and Sumter, distribution of white and Negro population at various dates, results of the election of 1876, Ku Klux Klan activities, illiteracy statistics, and rainfall distribution. A *Teacher's Manual,* prepared by Professor Wallace to accompany the maps, includes an essay on the origin of the state seal, an explanation of the complicated problem of parishes, election districts, judicial districts, and counties, a list of counties whose names have been changed at one time or another, a brief essay on the physical features of the state, and a list of the county seats and their elevations above sea level.

The University of Arkansas Library has secured a file of the London *Times,* 1870-1921 (199 volumes), and also *Palmer's Index to the Times Newspaper,* 1872-1922. The University's Museum has secured a grant of $115,000 from WPA for archaeological excavations. Professor S. C. Dellinger, curator of the Museum, plans to make a survey of the whole state, looking for burial grounds and village and mound sites. The finds will be left with the University Museum. This work will be a continuation of a project begun ten years ago.

The Library of the University of Chattanooga has recently been given a hundred volumes of American history and biography by George Fort Milton. The books represent a portion of the library which Mr. Milton collected in writing *The Age of Hate* and *The Eve of Conflict,* and among them are many exceedingly rare and valuable works on Southern history.

A new $350,000 library building is being erected on the University of Chattanooga campus. Built partially by WPA funds, the building will house not only the University Library but also that of the city and county as well, giving the necessary space for the rapidly growing collections of each. Two library staffs will continue to be used, and the libraries will be separate within the same building. Completion is expected by the opening of the fall semester of 1939.

The Oklahoma Historical Society has acquired a complete file of the *Oklahoma News,* 369 volumes; the archives of the G. A. R. post of Sapulpa, Oklahoma; several hundred letters from the Oklahoma Baptist Headquarters written thirty years ago; transcripts of missionary letters written in the 1870's and relating to activities among Oklahoma Indians.

The Virginia Historical Society has recently acquired photostatic copies and copies of original letters relating to the Farrer-Collett families; 23 bound volumes of the Richmond *State;* a large collection of original letters and papers of the Preston family.

The Department of History at the University of Kentucky received a special grant of $1,000 for the purchase of books for its collection. The University has also provided a portion of the Haggin Fund for University publications, a part of which will be used each year for the publication of monographs in Kentucky history.

Among recent acquisitions of the University of Alabama Library are the complete records of the Shelby (Alabama) Iron Works from 1859 to 1915. These not only give a cross section view of the iron industry in Alabama, but also contain a great deal of correspondence between the officials of the company and the Ordnance Bureau of the Confederacy. They throw much light upon the problems that faced General Gorgas and Colonel St. John. The Library has also acquired the Robert Jemison Papers, valuable in connection with the plantation history of Alabama, the stagecoach business, and the building of the Alabama Great Southern Railway. Bound volumes of the Mobile *Register* from 1865 to the present have also been added to the Library's collection.

The records of the Confederate post office, treasury, and war departments, and the military and congressional records of the Confederacy, seized at the close of the war, have been deposited in The National Archives. Records of the Southern Claims Commission, 1871-1880, have been transferred from the treasury department.

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"Carter Berkeley, An Old Virginia Doctor," by Frances Berkeley Young, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (January).

"Reverend Dr. John Clayton and His Early Map of Jamestown, Virginia," by C. A. Browne, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (January).

"The Colonial Churches of Christ Church Parish, Middlesex County, Virginia," by George C. Mason, *ibid.*

"America's 'Multicaulis Mania,'" by Elizabeth H. Ryland, *ibid.*

"Three Rectors of Hungar's Parish and their Wife," by Mrs. P. W. Hiden, *ibid.*

"Captain Cameron and Sergeant Champe," by William B. McGroarty, *ibid.*

"Literary Tastes in Virginia before Poe," by Richard B. Davis, *ibid.*

"The Hillsman House," by W. R. Turner, *ibid.*

"The Plank Road Movement in North Carolina," I, by Robert B. Starling, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (January).

"A History of Kentucky Literature since 1913," by John W. Townsend, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (January).

"Guardian of Kentuckiana . . . R. C. Ballard Thruston," by Marion Porter, *ibid.*

"The Saxon Immigration to Missouri, 1838-1839," by P. E. Kretzmann, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (January).

"Portraits of Daniel Boone," by Roy T. King, *ibid.*

"The War of 1812 on the Missouri Frontier," II, by Kate L. Gregg, *ibid.*

"Historic Sites Around Anadarko," by C. Ross Hume, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (December).

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"James Glen's Will," contributed by E. Katherine Anderson, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (January).

"Notes from the Records of Stafford County, Virginia, Order Books," continued, *ibid.*

"Diary of Col. William Bolling of Bolling Hall," continued, *ibid.*

"Montgomery County's Revolutionary Heritage," continued, by Ruby A. Roberts, *ibid.*

"Marriage License Records of Northumberland County, Virginia, from 1735 to 1795," listed and arranged by Lillian A. Hatton, *ibid.*

"Bevill or Beville Family," by Agnes B. V. Tedcastle, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (January).

"A North Carolina Citizen on the Federal Constitution, 1788," edited by Julian P. Boyd, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (January).

"Unpublished Letters from North Carolinians to Polk," edited by Elizabeth G. McPherson, *ibid.*

"Notes on One of the Early Ballard Families of Kentucky, Including the Ballard Massacre," by Margaret M. Bridwell, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (January).

"Some Letters of Isaac Shelby," edited by James A. Padgett, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (January).

"Kentucky Marriages and Obituaries," continued, compiled and edited by G. Glenn Clift, *ibid.*

"James Harrod's Estate: Kentucky Prosperity in 1793," by Ila E. Fowler, *ibid.*

"Clay and California Statehood," by Robert J. Parker, *ibid.*

"The Will of Judge John Graham, of Floyd County, Kentucky," edited by Willard R. Jillson, *ibid.*

"Letters of George Caleb Bingham to James S. Rollins," VI, edited by C. B. Rollins, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (January).

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"Radical Disfranchisement in South Carolina (1867-68)," by William A. Russ, Jr., in the Susquehanna University *Studies* (January).

"Bourbonism in Georgia," by C. Vann Woodward, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (January).

"The Great Savannah Fire of 1820," by E. Merton Coulter, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (March).

"Causton's Bluff, Deptford, Brewton Hill: Three Allied Plantations," by Savannah Unit, Federal Writers' Project, *ibid.*

"Georgia Archaeology with Especial Reference to Recent Investigations in the Interior and on the Coast," by Charles C. Harrold, *ibid.*

"The Military Occupation of British West Florida, 1763," by C. N. Howard, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (January).

"The Disston Land Purchase," by T. Frederick Davis, *ibid.*

"DeBrahm's Report on East Florida, 1773," by Carita D. Corse, *ibid.*

"John Carmichael Jenkins, Scientific Planter of the Natchez District," by Albert G. Seal, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (January).

"The Sources of History of the Mississippi Territory," by William B. Hamilton, *ibid.*

"The Interval of Military Government in West Florida," by C. N. Howard, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (January).

"Jacobinism in Spanish Louisiana, 1792-1797," by Ernest R. Liljegren, *ibid.*

"Shadow over the City," by John S. Kendall, *ibid.*

"The History of Carrollton," by William H. Williams, *ibid.*

"Joaquin Miller in New Orleans," by Arlin Turner, *ibid.*

"The First Cattle in Texas and the Southwest: Progenitors of the Longhorns," by J. Frank Dobie, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (January).

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"Colonel Joseph Glover and His Descendants," compiled by William L. Glover, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (January).

"Journal of Gen. Peter Horry," continued, edited by A. S. Salley, *ibid.*

"Copy of Some Loose Pages Found among the Manigault Papers, in the Hand Writing of Dr. Gabriel Manigault, October 25, 1888," contributed by Mabel L. Webber, *ibid.*

"The Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1765-1775," continued, contributed by Mabel L. Webber, copied by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*

"Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette of Charleston, S. C.," continued, contributed by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*

"Papers Relating to the Georgia-Florida Frontier, 1784-1800," X, edited and translated by D. C. Corbitt, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (March).

"Old Canoochee Backwoods Sketches," V, by Julia E. Harn, *ibid.*

"The Panton, Leslie Papers: Letters of Edmund Doyle," III, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (January).

"Mississippi Unionism: The Case of the Reverend James A. Lyon," edited by John K. Bettersworth, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (January).

"The Reply of Peter Chester, Governor of West Florida, to Complaints Made against His Administration," edited by James A. Padgett, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (January).

"The Schism of 1805 in New Orleans," edited by Stanley Faye, *ibid.*

"Rabbi James Koppel Guttheim," by Leo Shpall, *ibid.*

"Records of the Superior Council of Louisiana," LXXVIII, by Heloise Cruzat, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*

"Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana," LX, by Laura L. Porteous, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*

"Colonel J. K. F. Mansfield's Report of the Inspection of the Department of Texas in 1856," continued, edited by M. L. Crimmins, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (January).

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES AND COMPILATIONS

"Walter Lynwood Fleming: Southern Scholar," by Milledge L. Bonham, Jr., in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (January).

"Race Consciousness as Reflected in the Negro Press," by T. G. Standing, in the *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* (December).

"Sir Joseph de Courcy Laffan's Views on Slavery," by Margaret R. H. Cocke, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (January).

"The Relationship of Florida Archaeology to That of Middle America," by Doris Stone, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (January).

"The Confederate Baggage and Treasure Train Ends its Flight in Florida: A Diary of Tench Francis Tilghman," edited by A. J. Hanna, *ibid.*

"Chief Samuel Checote, with Sketches of Chiefs Locher Harjo and Ward Coachman," by John B. Meserve, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (December).

"The Chickasaw Threat to French Control of the Mississippi in the 1740's," by Norman W. Caldwell, *ibid.*

"The Friendship of John Sharp Williams and Woodrow Wilson," by George C. Osborn, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (January).

"Hugh Harris Robison Letters," edited by Weymouth T. Jordan, *ibid.*

"Miami University, Calvinism, and the Anti-Slavery Movement," by James H. Rodabaugh, in the *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* (January).

"Hennepin's Voyage to the Gulf of Mexico, 1860," by Jean Delanglez, in *Mid-America* (January).

"The Robert Cavelier de la Salle Monument at Lachine, Canada: The Famous Explorer, Idealist and Realist," by André Lafargue, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (January).

"Two Unpublished Letters of Jefferson Davis," edited by Alfred P. James, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (March).

"Daugherty: A Complete Index to and Abstract of the Name and Variations of the Spelling in the Virginia Land Office at Richmond," compiled by C. B. Heinemann, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (January).

"A True Story of the Old South: Notes from a Confederate Diary," edited by C. H. Brannon, *ibid.*

"An Illinois State Agent in Washington: The Activities of Harry Dewitt Cook, 1865-1871," by Robert D. Ocks, in the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* (December).

CONTRIBUTORS

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY is professor of history at Vanderbilt University.

PAUL WALLACE GATES is assistant professor of American history at Cornell University.

FRED HARVEY HARRINGTON is instructor in history at the University of Wisconsin.

HARVEY WISH is assistant professor of history at De Paul University.

CURTIS W. GARRISON is director of research at the Hayes Memorial Library, Fremont, Ohio.

JAMES J. TALMAN is director of the Ontario Department of Public Records and Archives and acting legislative librarian of Ontario, Toronto, Canada.

THE REPRESSIBLE CONFLICT
1830-1861

By Avery Craven

This volume contains the three Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures on Southern History delivered by Avery Craven at Louisiana State University in 1938.

In these, Professor Craven subjects to unsparing analysis the traditional issues over which the Civil War was fought. The movement for abolition is viewed as an economic crusade flaunting the banners of righteousness, patriotism and freedom, which was directed, not against the "peculiar institution" of slavery as it actually existed, but against slavery as the symbol of Southern agrarianism in conflict with Northern industrialism.

xi, 97 pages. Cloth. Octavo. $1.50.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University, Louisiana

THE JOURNAL OF POLITICS

Published quarterly by

The Southern Political Science Association and the University of Florida

VOLUME I NUMBER I

Leading articles in the first issue are as follows:

"What is a Political Theory?"
George H. Sabine, *Sage School of Philosophy, Cornell University.*

"The President as Administrative Chief"
Edward S. Corwin, *Princeton University.*

"Research and Public Action"
George A. Shipman, *Duke University.*

"Administrative Reorganization: An Adventure into Science and Theology"
Charles S. Hyneman, *Louisiana State University.*

The leading articles will often be general in their scope. The book reviews will cover the leading materials in the field. The aim of the Journal is to present material which will touch upon the dynamics of politics and questions of interpretation as well as factual and analytical material.

Concerning subscriptions ($3.00 per year for active membership, $1.50 for students) and membership questions, communications should be addressed to M. J. Dauer, Managing Editor, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida. Editorial material should be sent to the Editor, Robert J. Harris, Jr., Louisiana State University, University, Louisiana.

The JOURNAL of SOUTHERN HISTORY

VOL. V AUGUST, 1939 No. 3



Published quarterly by the

SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME V AUGUST, 1939 NUMBER 3

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

BOARD OF EDITORS

JOHN D. BARNHART
Louisiana State University

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL
University of Texas

AVERY O. CRAVEN
University of Chicago

WALTER B. POSEY
Birmingham-Southern College

WILLIAM O. LYNCH
Indiana University

PHILIP DAVIDSON
Agnes Scott College

FRANK L. OWSLEY
Vanderbilt University

W. NEIL FRANKLIN
The National Archives

MANAGING EDITOR
WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE
FRED C. COLE, Louisiana State University

GUARANTOR
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Louisiana State University, University, Louisiana.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

CONTENTS

The "Turner Theories" and the South. By Avery Craven 291

The Effects of the Civil War on the Louisiana Sugar Industry. By Walter Prichard 315

Cultural Factors in the History of the South. By Richard H. Shryock 333

The American Society of Equity in Kentucky: A Recent Attempt in Agrarian Reform. By Theodore Saloutos 347

Notes and Documents

Ulrich Bonnell Phillips: Historian of the South. By Fred Landon 364

Southern Designs on Cuba, 1854-1857, and Some European Opinions. Edited by Gavin B. Henderson 371

Book Reviews

Shotwell, *The History of History,* I, by Charles Edward Smith 386

Edwards, *The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner,* by W. Stull Holt. 387

Marable and Boylan, *A Handbook of Oklahoma Writers,* by James W. Moffitt 389

Forman, *Jamestown and St. Mary's, Buried Cities of Romance,* by Wesley Frank Craven 390

Griggs, *Thomas Clarkson: The Friend of Slaves,* by Gilbert H. Barnes 392

Sonne, *Liberal Kentucky, 1780-1828,* by R. S. Cotterill 393

Owen, *Alabama: A Social and Economic History of the State,* by John B. Clark 394

Kohn and Glenn, *Internal Improvement in South Carolina, 1817-1828,* by David C. Duniway 395

Newsome, *The Presidential Election of 1824 in North Carolina,* by Charles S. Sydnor 396

Fraser, *Democracy in the Making: The Jackson-Tyler Era,* by Fletcher M. Green 397

Clark, *The Rampaging Frontier,* by Carl Wittke 398

Burne, *Lee, Grant and Sherman: A Study in Leadership in the 1864-65 Campaign,* by Thomas Robson Hay 400

Stern, *The Man Who Killed Lincoln,* by William H. Ellison 401

Horn, *Invisible Empire: The Story of the Ku Klux Klan, 1866-1871,* by R. H. Woody 402

Bond, *Negro Education in Alabama,* by Curtis W. Garrison 404

Crowell, *Personal Recollections of Trinity College, North Carolina, 1887-1894,* by Holland Thompson 405

Davidson, *Child Labor Legislation in the Southern Textile States,* by C. Vann Woodward 407

Palmer, *Carter Glass: Unreconstructed Rebel,* by Allen W. Moger 408

James, *George W. Truett: A Biography,* by H. A. Trexler 410

Historical News and Notices 411

Personal 412

Historical Societies 415

Bibliographical 418

Contributors 427

The "Turner Theories" and the South[1]

By Avery Craven

"Each age tries to form its own conception of the past."[2] According to its own standards it selects and emphasizes. From what seems to be significant it writes its history. But time alters historical values. That which impresses one generation as important may not seem so to the next. That which explains clearly to one group of men the course of events may appear to a later group to be entirely inadequate. History is, therefore, never fixed. It is never final.

A generation ago (1893) Frederick Jackson Turner arose in emphatic protest against the interpretation of American history which predecessors had handed down, and which his instructors at Johns Hopkins still accepted. It emphasized the germ theory of politics and held that American institutions were but a continuation of European beginnings. Turner, fresh from Wisconsin where he had seen the last stages of the frontier pass into modern complexity, felt that this did not explain facts as he knew them. He was confident that European institutions and practices, forced constantly to adjust themselves to new physical environments in the American West, were altered to some degree and became less European and more American.[3] Perhaps also he was lifting a Western voice, along with Populist and farmer, who in the early 1890's felt themselves neglected, the term "businessman" too narrowly defined, and

[1] This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association in New Orleans, November 3, 1938. It was subtitled: "To what extent do the theories and studies of Frederick Jackson Turner constitute a true interpretation of the development of the South?"

[2] *The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner* (Madison, Wis., 1938), 52.

[3] Frederick J. Turner to Carl Becker, December 16, 1925 (Huntington Library).

the interest of those in power too much centered on Eastern industrialists. The West, in general, was in a protesting mood.[4]

At any rate, the Turner suggestion took hold. A few staid historians on the Atlantic coast went their way quite untouched. Turner never won more than footnote recognition from some of them. But in the West, where state universities were beginning to expand at an unheard of rate, the approach he offered carried conviction in line with things still to be observed. American history began to be "reinterpreted and re-written because of him." For the next forty years, as one scholar has said, he "so completely dominated American historical writing that hardly a single production in all that time . . . failed to show the marks of his influence."[5]

But times have changed and with them our tastes in historical interpretation. The revisionists have fallen on Turner. One of them solemnly tells us that Turner's influence has been all to the bad; that he turned the eyes of the historians toward the frontier when they should have been fixed upon Europe and the international situations of which we were soon to be so much a part. Turner talked of *sectional* cleavage and interests when he should have emphasized the far more important *class* conflict, which is, as anyone should know, the really important division in American life. This critic speaks of Turner's work as an "extraordinary collection of learning . . . quite worthless."[6]

Most of these criticisms and of others which have been offered are based on the assumption that Turner intended to present a very clear and exact theory of American history and that this theory presumed to offer "a true and complete interpretation" of the development of the United States and of different sections in the United States. If the assumptions be correct, no one should be surprised that the modern historian, with his keener appreciation of the complexity of human affairs, has come to question the value of Turner's work. Most certainly in a

[4] Avery Craven, "Frederick Jackson Turner," in William T. Hutchinson (ed.), *Marcus W. Jernegan Essays in American Historiography* (Chicago, 1937), 252-70.

[5] Merle E. Curti, in Stuart A. Rice (ed.) *Methods in Social Science* (Chicago, 1931), 367; Louis M. Hacker, in the *Nation* (New York, 1865-), CXXXVII (1933), 108.

[6] Hacker, in the *Nation,* CXXXVII, 108-10.

field like that of the South, where most of the scholarly research has been done since Turner wrote and where revision is the order of the day, a careful restatement of the "frontier thesis" and a revaluation of its application is in order.

The best statement of Turner's "theories," I presume, is to be found in the essay entitled "The Significance of the Frontier in American History." Turner later made some slight alterations in the views there expressed and changed the emphasis somewhat, but the original statement was the one seized upon and ever adhered to by "followers"—a breed of pest by which Turner was unusually cursed—and given by them wide application and wider currency.

The major assertions in this essay were to the effect that American history up to 1890 had been largely the history of the colonization of the West; that the "peculiarity of American institutions" was "the fact that they had been compelled to adapt themselves to the changes of an expanding people" who entered a succession of wildernesses and attempted to transform them into urban complexity.[7] Because the point of most pronounced change, through the interaction of men and institutions and environment on each other, was on the outer edge of advance, Turner centered attention there. He called it "the frontier" and said that the significant thing about it was the fact that it lay "at the hither edge of free land."[8] But he was evidently using the term very loosely, for he later spoke of an Indian and hunter stage, of traders and herdsmen, of exploitive single-crop farmers, and called the thing he was talking about "a process" not unlike that through which the human race had passed in its long journey upward from savagery to factories.[9]

He described the various types of frontiers and their modes of advance and then turned to the results produced by the process on men and institutions. What were the effects of being ever in motion, always readjusting to a new environment? What was added to or subtracted from the European peoples and practices by being planted on the Eastern seaboard and then pushed steadily westward for three centuries?

[7] Frederick J. Turner, *The Frontier in American History* (New York, 1920), 2.
[8] *Ibid.*, 3.
[9] *Ibid.*, 11.

Turner's answer was unquestionably intended to be both broad and general. Yet it had, unfortunately, to deal with specific qualities and characteristics. He believed that successive returns to the primitive and the forced readjustments to new environments caused men and institutions to be better fitted to the requirements of this continent. They were, in other words, *Americanized.*[10] That meant both the exaggeration of old traits and the addition of new ones. It might mean only a change in tone and temper.

The first change, developed in a somewhat confused and vague fashion in Turner's essay, had to do with *Nationalism.* As a mixing and melting pot the West blended different European groups into a "composite nationality."[11] Local questions, such as slavery, became national through expansion. Trade became internal to a new degree, and domestic problems, such as land, internal improvements, and markets, tended to crowd aside those which dealt with foreign affairs. Even the Constitution was modified because Louisiana had to be purchased in the interests of Western men.[12]

A second result had to do with that illusive thing called democracy. In this case it seems to have meant the increase of rugged individualism, as "fools" insisted on putting on their own coats for themselves, in the broadening of the franchise, and in a larger participation by common men in politics.[13]

Lastly, the frontier tended to change the fiber and mental attitudes of men themselves, by adding a "coarseness and strength combined with acuteness and inquisitiveness," a "practical, inventive turn of mind," a "masterful grasp of material things," and "a buoyancy and exuberance" of spirit born of freedom and opportunity.[14]

In later writings something is said of the idealism engendered by the chance to begin over again in a constantly reshaping society. Much is made of the sectionalism which arose as different streams of population

[10] *Ibid.,* 18.
[11] *Ibid.,* 22.
[12] *Ibid.,* 25.
[13] *Ibid.,* 30.
[14] *Ibid.,* 37.

occupied differing physical basins and as a new and more native order arose to contend with older ones.

The general implication in this approach, as I see it, is that a new flavor, more American, was imparted to men and ways which experienced this constant retrial on a succession of frontiers. Yet on closer examination, this flavor proves to be a very uncertain thing. The emerging American qualities turn out to be only a bundle of contradictions. The West bred nationalism and sectionalism at the same time; it encouraged rugged individualism and yet forced a new degree of co-operation if men were to survive its dangers; it made its people coarse and material in mind and turned them into dreamers and idealists; it welcomed the innovator and forced a conservative conformity to existing practices upon those who would remain alive; it practiced democracy but tolerated slavery and set men to grasping for all the means to inequality.

What are we to conclude from such contradictions? Either that Turner had only a very vague conception of his own contribution or that he considered these effects of the frontier, on which so many scholars have seized as the sum and substance of "the Turner thesis," as of no major importance. The conclusion is obvious. Turner believed that the *process* he was describing was the significant thing, not its effects on individuals and practices. Along that line it was only necessary to notice general drifts and to state them in general terms. Crosscurrents in the larger streams could be ignored. His emphasis was on *change,* not on *specific changes.* The *approach* was the important thing, not some exact pattern which might appear in its application. In fact, an exact pattern in all regions was not to be expected. The social and racial groups and the cultural patterns which moved out from old centers into the American Wests differed too greatly from each other. Those of New England or the Middle States differed as much from those of the South as did the environments into which they were thrust. The English groups carried different cultural patterns, such as home life or agricultural practices, from those of the German or Scotch-Irish who moved alongside of them. The West worked changes, sometimes great,

sometimes small, on each of these. But it was primarily a change in flavor, not in form, save as all became gradually "Americanized." Frontiers differed. They did tend to develop a more or less common outlook and a few common practices, but differing cultural patterns still persisted. A Swedish settlement on the frontier differed from a German one; a timber frontier differed from a mining camp. Frontiers should be compared for greatest historical comprehension. In no other way could the influence of sectionalism in American history be properly understood.

The basic facts which Turner suggested for a better understanding of American history were, therefore, first: that throughout the formative period the new Wests, with something of common needs and outlook, were the most typical and the most influential portions of the nation; and second: that Wests in turn became Easts, leaving the future to sectional and class conflicts which might produce quite another America showing the traces of frontier experiences only as a landscape reveals the action of glaciers in ages long passed.

That Turner thought that this approach—I call it an approach, not a theory or a thesis—applied to the South, there can be no question. That he considered it, in itself, "a true interpretation of the development of the South," or of any other section, for that matter, I seriously doubt. There was never anything final or dogmatic about Turner. He once said that "this paper makes no attempt to treat the subject exhaustively; its aim is to call attention to the frontier as a fertile field for investigation and to suggest some of the problems which arise in connection with it."[15] But within those limits he did include the Southern advances into the West without reservations of any kind. He mentions the various frontier stages shown in Virginia and the Carolinas—trapper, herdsman, and exploitive farmer, and includes the fall line and the Southern mountains among the natural frontier boundaries that are to be noted. It was at Cumberland Gap that he took his station to

[15] Turner to Constance L. Skinner, March 18, 1922, "Notes Concerning my Correspondence with Frederick Jackson Turner," in *Wisconsin Magazine of History* (Menasha, Madison, 1917-), XIX (1935), 91-103.

watch these stages moving, procession-like, into the interior. He notes the Western influence on Southern land legislation, religious developments, and slavery attitudes, and climaxes his political discussion by asserting that the West made Jefferson's democracy into the national republicanism of Monroe and the democracy of Jackson—all three Southern men. He finds his best illustrations of sectionalism, produced by expansion, in the Southern colonies and states.[16] The Regulator movements in the Carolinas and the constitutional struggles in Virginia and North Carolina stand out in his pages as significant evidences of both the sectional and the democratic force of the West.[17]

In a second essay entitled "The Old West,"[18] Turner enlarges on these Southern applications. The Western angles of Bacon's Rebellion and the early establishment up the James of Indian trading posts and forts, where "the warlike Christian man" was to be stationed, are a part of his picture of "the fighting frontier." The "cow-drovers" in the piedmont, wandering from range to range, followed by the Scotch-Irish, German, Welsh, and English farmers, each group with its own peculiar brand of evangelical faith, the grasping speculator and the ever-present squatter help to form what he calls "the New Society"—more democratic, more self-sufficing, more primitive and individualistic than that which had evolved out of Old World beginnings on the Atlantic coast.

This new order in the Southern West created internal trade, raised the issues of nativism and lower standards of living, and set the old, on the coast, and the new, in the interior, in conflict over such questions as a broader franchise, a more equitable representation, a wider religious toleration, the use of slaves, and even the proper relations between the colonies and the Mother Country. Most certainly Turner found the Southern frontier significant and the early Southern Wests to reveal all the traits and to exercise all the influences which he had described as typical.

Here were Old World patterns set down in a wilderness—a country-gentleman ideal, peculiar forms of local government—including as es-

[16] Turner, *Frontier in American History*, 29.
[17] *Ibid.*, 113-21.
[18] *Ibid.*, 67-125.

sentials the county court, the sheriff, and the county lieutenant, an established church, and a tradition to aristocracy. Here also were German, Scotch-Irish, and other groups with cultural patterns quite distinct. All had come to America—the first great West. All had been changed to some degree. The interplay of environment and institutions had given something new in temper as well as in practice which in the end made harmony between England and the colonies impossible. Europeans had become Americans.

Further expansion into the interior had produced another social unit differing in turn from that on the coast. It too had found that the political ties which bound it to an older society gave less than satisfactory scope for development. The ending of primogeniture and entail, the broadening of religious freedom, the readjustment of representation and the franchise, and even the shifting of capitals to the westward, had all come in answer to its demands. The new Wests of the South had demonstrated both their differing character and their increasing power. They had also altered old practices and old institutions to the more simple requirements of the small-farming economy which they practiced. The great piedmont region above the fall line, sweeping from Pennsylvania to Middle Georgia, formed a unity in itself as against the separate entities into which the coastal region was divided. In characteristics and attitudes it met all the Turner requirements. In course of development and in influence it provided a satisfactory case study for his approach.

Up to this point, I take it, few would deny the value of the Turner "theories and studies" in making an approach to the "development of the South." The process of change from old to new, and the sectionalism produced by expansion and readjustment are fundamental to any clear understanding of the section. Even democracy, when understood as men of that day understood it—as a stirring for the recognition of new groups and rights—is clearly discernible; nationalism, in the sense of turning attention to native problems and seeking native answers to them, flavors the whole story. No historian, as far as I know, has ques-

tioned the value of the Turner approach to this period, or doubted the soundness of its conclusions. The real problem comes with the rise of the Cotton Kingdom. There conditions become so complex and tangled that even Turner himself seems to have been somewhat uncertain. Others have frankly denied the continuation of the Western process and viewed the entire South as a unique entity in the national pattern.

Professor Frederic Logan Paxson is particularly emphatic on this point. He insists that because the plantation and Negro slavery played a part in the settlement of the Southwest the region forfeited its Western character and began "living in a new cycle." "In the generation that ends at Gettysburg and Vicksburg," he says, "the South ceased to be the West, and became enchained in a destiny of its own, in one of the great tragedies of social history." Because it did not reproduce the pattern which was being worked out in the Northwest of the day, it did not stay "true to the American standard."[19] Other scholars, while not directly denying the validity of the Turner approach, have laid emphasis on other things and found other central themes in the Southern story. The late Ulrich Bonnell Phillips once argued that the race question gave unity to Southern history and declared that the determination to keep the section a white man's country explained the larger course of developments.[20] Another writer, trying to explain what makes the South Southern, has listed its weather, its English country-gentleman ideal, its Negroes, and its dominantly rural character as the essential ingredients. He has found its story from 1830 to 1861 to have been shaped primarily by the constant necessity of defending itself against a Northern crusade, launched first against slavery but later broadened out to include the whole Southern way of life.[21] The inference is that the frontier and the influences which it normally produced are lost in the struggle between North and South. True, these sections did come to conflict over the matter of slavery in the new territories, but the contest in Kansas in the fifties was more a manifestation of hostilities already engendered

[19] Frederic L. Paxson, *When the West is Gone* (New York, 1930), 63-65.

[20] Ulrich B. Phillips, "The Central Theme of Southern History," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXXIV (1929), 30-43.

[21] Avery Craven, *The Repressible Conflict, 1830-1861* (University, La., 1939), Chap. I.

over other issues than a struggle over actual slavery expansion. There were only three slaves in Kansas in 1860.

What then of the frontier theory in this period? Did it cease to apply? Did a factor which had been of such great significance in an earlier period cease to influence the course of development in this? If so the abolition charge that the ante-bellum South was thoroughly un-American had some foundation.

To begin with, it should be understood that expansion of far greater proportions than the Old South had ever experienced went on in the period from 1820 to 1860. The pressure from wasted lands, failing markets, and unsatisfactory political conditions in the Eastern states was never so great. The lure of fresh lands, where cotton might grow and restore the failing fortunes of the section, was never quite so strong. Out of Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, and Tennessee settlers poured into the Gulf region to push back quickly the forest and to establish a new order. From 1820 to 1830 Virginia's rate of population increase fell from 37½ per cent to 13½ and in the next decade to less than 4 per cent. Speakers told of "Vast regions, once the abode of a numerous population, of plenty, and of social happiness" now "re-committed to the forest"; of "tide[s] of emigration . . . from all classes; as if the angel of desolation had cursed the land, and imbued the people with a hatred to the place of their nativity." By 1850 nearly one third of the Virginia-born were living in other states.[22]

North Carolina suffered even more. Her rate of population increase fell from 15 per cent in 1830 to 2.1 per cent in 1840 and it still stood under 15 per cent in 1860. "The Alabama fever" raged with great violence and carried off "vast numbers . . . of citizens." "Anxiety and confusion" pervaded "all ranks of the people."[23] Lands lost their value and poverty became universal. Only Connecticut in this era and

[22] *Seventh Census of the United States: 1850,* pp. 241 ff.; *Farmers' Register* (Shellbanks, Petersburg, Va., 1833-1842), III (1836), 685-89; II (1835), 762-64.

[23] *Seventh Census . . . 1850,* pp. 297 ff.; J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton (ed.), *Papers of Thomas Ruffin,* 4 vols. (Raleigh, 1918-1920), I, 193-95, 197-99; Guion G. Johnson, "Social Characteristics of Ante-Bellum North Carolina," in *North Carolina Historical Review* (Raleigh, 1924-), VI (1929), 144-47.

Iowa in a later one have matched the contributions to the West made by the Old North State.

The same story can be told for South Carolina and the older counties of Georgia and Tennessee. The first of these showed population gains of only 15 per cent in 1830 and of only 2¼ in 1850. In 1860 there were 193,000 South Carolina-born living outside the parent state as against 276,000 remaining at home. Forty per cent of her people had sought homes in the West. Men spoke of "the wilderness regaining her empire"; of "the once thriving planter . . . tearing himself from the scenes of his childhood, and the bones of his ancestors, to seek in the wilderness" the things not to be found at home.[24]

The Southwest, meanwhile, grew in direct proportion to these losses. From 1830 to 1840 Alabama increased its whites by 76 per cent and its Negroes by 114; Mississippi, its whites by 154 per cent and its Negroes by 197. The actual gains in Alabama were ten times those of Virginia and twenty times those of South Carolina. And this was but the beginning of a great westward sweep that would follow the Gulf to the Mexican border and across it and reach north and west to Arkansas. The south central states, as a whole, grew three times as fast in the 1830's as did the Old South and by 1850 outnumbered the parent states by over 300,000, having added a million and a quarter in the last decade alone. As early as 1834 they were producing the bulk of the cotton crop and had begun their economic domination of the whole section.[25]

This advance had all the characteristics usually ascribed to the westward movement. There were distinct stages which in turn conformed to the accepted patterns. Trappers and traders from the Old South had entered the Indian country well before the Revolution and had opened the ways through which others were to follow. Furs and skins became an essential part of the Southern surplus which went out from Richmond and Charleston to the world. Trade contacts altered Indian soci-

[24] *Seventh Census . . . 1850,* pp. 333 ff., 353 ff., 533 ff.; *Congressional Debates,* 22 Cong., 1 Sess., 80-81 (January 16, 1832).

[25] Thomas P. Abernethy, *The Formative Period in Alabama, 1815-1828* (Montgomery, 1922); Frederick J. Turner, *The United States, 1830-1850* (New York, 1935), 213-15; *id., The Rise of the New West, 1819-1829* (New York, 1906), 47.

ety, threw the tribes into international alliances, and produced a group of half-breed leaders hardly equalled for diplomatic ability in the American story.[26] The frontier pressure against these tribes lifted military leaders, like Andrew Jackson, to national importance and forced the development of the nation's final Indian policy of removal and "permanent" reservations across the Mississippi River. It would be difficult to find a more typical frontier attitude and action against the red man than that revealed by the Georgians in the 1820's.[27]

There was also a Southern pastoral stage. John G. W. de Brahm described it in the back country of the Carolinas just before the Revolution. He told of great herds of cattle sent down into Georgia, there to be herded and driven from range to range by cowpen keepers "like ancient Patriarchs or modern Bedowins." Roundups and brandings, expert horsemen, and the whole paraphernalia of the cattle trade![28] A generation later cowmen were all along the borders of the Indian country awaiting the departure of the tribes for the West but not hesitating, in the face of government agreements with the Indians, to pasture their cattle on the Indian lands.[29] The Oklahoma "Sooner" was in the making.

By the 1840's the cowboys had reached the piney-woods section of Mississippi, where, mounted on their "low built, shaggy, but muscular and hardy horses of that region, and armed with rawhide whips . . . and sometimes with a catching rope or lasso . . . . They scour[ed] the woods . . . sometimes driving a herd of a thousand heads to the pen."[30]

The cattle days in Louisiana and Texas are better known but somehow it has not occurred to the historian that this stage of frontier development had its best expression in the South, developed its important

[26] Verner W. Crane, *The Southern Frontier, 1670-1732* (Durham, 1928), 108-36, 254-80.

[27] Ulrich B. Phillips, *Georgia and State Rights* (Washington, 1902), 39-86.

[28] Plowdon C. J. Weston (ed.), *Documents Connected with the History of South Carolina* (London, 1856), 200.

[29] Franklin L. Riley (comp.), "Autobiography of Gideon Lincecum," in Mississippi Historical Society, *Publications* (Oxford, etc., 1897-1914; Centenary Series, 1916-1925), VIII (1904), 443-65.

[30] J. F. H. Claiborne, "A Trip through the Piney Woods," *ibid.*, IX (1906), 521.

features there, and passed out of the South into the plains west, with which it is usually associated, with only slight changes in its character.[31]

The mining stage also had its place in the Southern advance. A recent writer has told of the "gold fever" which began to "rage" in North Carolina in 1825. Travelers reported hearing "scarce anything . . . except gold"; of "bankrupts . . . restored to affluence and paupers turned to nabobs." "The prospector" became "a distinct race" and the population 'round about "agonized under the increased and increasing fever for gold." Prospectors rushed about in quicksilver fashion from diggings to diggings, boom towns rose and fell, and "the state of morals" became "deplorably bad."[32] There is, in fact, little in the picture of the mining rushes which took place in North Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama in this period to distinguish them in temper or in character from those on other frontiers in other sections.

Nor did the early agricultural groups differ from those who in this period were pushing their way into the Old Northwest. The pioneering activities of Gideon Lincecum,[33] which began in Georgia just after the American Revolution and ended in Texas before the Civil War, might, with local variations, have been duplicated on the crest of any other frontier rolling westward. His grandfather had been killed by the Indians in North Carolina during the Revolution. His father, after a turn at Indian fighting, had spent some ten years farming about in different parts of the Georgia uplands, raising the first crop of cotton ever grown in that part of the state. He had accumulated property rapidly. Cotton brought high prices. But the West lured. Tennessee offered greater opportunities. Three times just after 1800 he started for that state with his family now augmented by a parcel of Negroes. Each time, however, after a stop on the way to raise a crop, he turned back

[31] Little is said of Texas, the most "Western" of the Southern states, in this paper. She entered the picture rather late but she was ready for secession with the other cotton states early in 1861. Texas was, therefore, Southern by the final test. Her Western character and spirit, on the other hand, were always so marked that writers on Western history have given her ample recognition and space. In spite of both slavery and the plantation system, no one has dared to suggest that she ever "ceased to be Western." The same holds for Arkansas. For that reason emphasis is here laid on the states east of the Mississippi.

[32] Fletcher M. Green, "Gold Mining: A Forgotten Industry of Ante-Bellum North Carolina," in *North Carolina Historical Review,* XIV (1937), 1-19, 135-55.

[33] Riley (comp.), "Autobiography of Gideon Lincecum," in *loc. cit.,* 443-519.

and at last settled down on the Georgia frontier to await the removal of the Muskogee Indians and the opening of their lands to settlement.

In these years the boy Gideon had learned to gather cotton and had spent a few months in the rude frontier schools. He now left home, clerked and farmed, studied medicine by reading a few books, and then got married. He showed every prospect of becoming a successful farmer until the Alabama fever caught him. Then, not waiting even to harvest his crop, he set out again with his father to seek a new home in a new wilderness. He paused for a season with the cattle men on the Okmulgee and then made his way through five hundred miles of forest to the little log town of Tuscaloosa. Two or three times later he moved on, keeping in the vanguard of settlement, sawing lumber, trading with the Indians, practicing medicine, and planting cotton. In 1834 he made a trip to Texas and after a few years longer in Mississippi moved there to end his days as a planter.

Gideon could hardly qualify as "the man of capital and enterprise" in the Turner picture, but he eminently fits the role of "the first agricultural pioneer." He presents sharp contrast to the wealthy and energetic Thomas Dabney,[84] who, finding his lands worn in old Virginia, picked up his whole plantation establishment and purchased four thousand acres of land from lesser men in Mississippi in the same year that Gideon was looking toward Texas. Gideon was the South's pioneer farmer —the exploiter of the soil's first wealth. Dabney represented the final purchaser—the man of wealth who brought "extensive" culture and permanent settlement. The two types taken together with the great body of farmers in between who were less restless than the one and less permanent than the other, complete an agricultural sequence which satisfies every requirement of the frontier process. The final pattern was not that reached in the Northwest but we should remember that Turner's emphasis was on *change,* not on some *fixed type of change.* Too long have scholars viewed the plantation as an anachronism in frontier development. It was, in fact, nothing more than the Southern expression of "capital and enterprise" in agriculture and it no more upset the

[84] Susan Dabney Smedes, *A Southern Planter: Social Life in the Old South* (New York, 1900), 1-26.

normal frontier process than did the bonanza farmers of the Northwest or the capitalist on the timber, cattle, or mining frontiers.

It should also be noticed that the flavor and practice of this great Southern West was thoroughly normal. Nor did they change any more rapidly than in any other West. "Flush days" in Alabama and Mississippi were the rule.[35] Speculation drove land prices up to as high as $70 an acre and pushed interest rates to from 40 to 50 per cent. Banking wrote new chapters even in frontier financial history and left debts unpaid even to this day.[36] Opportunity made liars out of honest men. One of them wrote home to Virginia in July, 1835, declaring that the weather in central Alabama was never more than warm and that the nights were so cool that he always slept under a blanket.[37] A New Orleans newspaper described the period as one in which the people were "drunk with success." "The poor man of yesterday was worth his thousands today; and the beggar of the morning retired to his straw pallet at night, burdened with the cares of a fortune acquired between the rising and the setting of the sun."[38] A visitor to the Louisiana metropolis in 1833 wrote: "There is a hurry, a 'rush' among all classes of people here, that I have not seen in so great a degree, elsewhere. It looks almost like intrusion to detain any one upon matters unconnected with ordinary business-pursuits."[39]

A Natchez citizen unblushingly complained of a sprained wrist and a dislocated thumb resulting from "a hard fought battle with Mr. Daniel Hickey, whose Eyes by the Bye I completely closed."[40] In March, 1856, the editor of an Alabama paper wrote that guns and pistols were being "fired in and from the alleys and streets of the town . . . until

[35] Joseph G. Baldwin, *The Flush Times of Alabama and Mississippi* (New York, 1853). For Western flavor in humor, see Arthur P. Hudson, *Humor of the Old Deep South* (New York, 1936).

[36] Reginald C. McGrane, *Foreign Bondholders and American State Debts* (New York, 1935).

[37] Benjamin Park to Lewis Hill, Sumter City, Alabama, July 8, 1853 (MS. in private hands).

[38] New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* February 6, 1850.

[39] Dwight L. Dumond (ed.), *Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1831-1857,* 2 vols. (New York, 1938), I, 69.

[40] Charles S. Sydnor, *A Gentleman of the Old Natchez Region: Benjamin L. C. Wailes* (Durham, 1938), 6.

it is hardly safe to go from house to house."[41] In the same year this paper carried a card for weeks offering a reward of $500 for the arrest of the "party" who on several occasions had shot at the signer through the Cahaba hotel window.[42] A city ordinance in Jacksonville, in the same state, prohibited the shooting of guns or pistols within two hundred yards of a dwelling. A schedule of fines for fights published in the Moulton *Democrat* in 1857 listed fist fights at from five to ten dollars, fights with sticks at twice as much, those with dirks at from twenty to thirty dollars, and those with bowie knives or pistols at from thirty to fifty dollars.[43] In twenty-three months of 1859-1860 the New Orleans chief of police arrested 62 persons for murder; 146 for stabbing with intent to murder; 734 for assault with deadly weapons; 42 for arson; 44 for burglary; 53 for highway robbery; 2,148 for larceny; 232 for swindling; 2,110 as suspicious characters; 47,403 for assault and battery, threats, and miscellaneous transgressions.[44]

Conduct along other lines revealed the same frontier temper. A visitor in Georgia just after the Revolution described the people as " 'the most prophane, blasphemous set . . . I ever heard of.' " She declared that she had seen groups of from fourteen to sixteen hundred assembled for public business " 'and perhaps not one in fifty but what we call fighting drunk.' "[45] Seargent Prentiss, writing of Mississippi in the early 1830's, said that "intemperance, skepticism, profaneness,[and] gambling" were "sadly prevalent."[46] An Alabama obituary praised the deceased for "honesty and integrity . . . when sober,"[47] and Ingraham declared that whiskey was the favorite beverage of the Mississippi yeoman, "present[ed] to the stranger with one hand, while they give

[41] Dallas *Gazette,* March 21, 1856. See, also, Frederick L. Olmsted, *A Journey in the Back Country* (New York, 1907), I, 143-44.

[42] Dallas *Gazette,* October 12, 1855.

[43] Minnie Clare Boyd, *Alabama in the Fifties* (New York, 1931), 197.

[44] New Orleans *Daily Crescent,* June 18, 1860. On gambling and drinking in Mississippi, see [George L. Prentiss, ed.], *A Memoir of S. S. Prentiss,* 2 vols. (New York, 1856), I, 129-36.

[45] Ulrich B. Phillips, *The Life of Robert Toombs* (New York, 1913), 5.

[46] [Prentiss, ed.], *Memoir of S. S. Prentiss,* I, 130-31.

[47] Dallas *Gazette,* November 21, 1856.

him a chair with the other."[48] Reuben Davis admitted that his people "drank hard, swore freely, and were utterly reckless of consequences when their passions were aroused," but insisted that they were sober, reverent, and industrious. His version of the Mississippian's creed is as good a statement of the frontiersman's social attitudes as can be found:

> A man ought to fear God, and mind his business. He should be respectful and courteous to all women; he should love his friends and hate his enemies. He should eat when he was hungry, drink when he was thirsty, dance when he was merry, vote for the candidate he likes best, and knock down any man who questioned his right to these privileges.[49]

Religious expression in the early Southern West was also of the frontier brand. The itinerant preacher usually pioneered the way for the different evangelical denominations. The wanderings and deeds of a Lorenzo Dow in Mississippi differ little in essential detail from those of a Peter Cartwright in Illinois.[50] Both of these men would have agreed with the Georgian, who a few years earlier insisted that "larnin" made the preachers "proud and worldly" and that frontiersmen wanted "none of your new-fangled, high-flying preaching."[51] Camp meetings flourished down to 1860 and men and women "got religion" after desperate struggles with the Lord and an undue amount of noise. A contemporary description of how Methodism won its way in the region would apply to all other denominations: "It lodged roughly, and it fared scantily. It tramped up muddy ridges, it swam or forded rivers to the waist; it slept on leaves or raw deer-skin, and pillowed its head on saddlebags; it bivouacked among wolves or Indians . . . *but it throve.*"[52]

The same frontier flavor characterized other lines of activity. Robert J. Walker and his Mississippi colleagues openly checked the bidding on government lands in the interest of their speculations[53] and an auctioneer in Alabama would "frequently stop crying the land" to suggest

[48] [Joseph H. Ingraham], *The South-West,* 2 vols. (New York, 1835), II, 172.

[49] Reuben Davis, *Recollections of Mississippi and Mississippians* (Boston, 1891), 18-19.

[50] *The Life, Travels, Labors, and Writings of Lorenzo Dow* (New York, 1851), 289-96; *History of Cosmopolite* (Philadelphia, 1815), 184-86, 214-18.

[51] John D. Wade, *Augustus Baldwin Longstreet, A Study of the Development of Culture in the South* (New York, 1924), 64.

[52] William E. Wightman, *Life of William Capers, D. D.* (Nashville, 1858), 471-72.

[53] *American State Papers, Public Lands,* VII, 495-96.

that buyers compromise and "quit fooling away your money."[54] It was an Alabama Senator who insisted that the squatters on the public domain were not "violators of the laws, and trespassers" but "meritorious individuals, because they have been the pioneers to all the new settlements in the West and Southwest."[55]

Nor was democracy lacking. Thomas Dabney met sharp resentment when he attended the house-raising with his slaves in Mississippi and when he used them to help get a sick neighbor's cotton out of the grass. He was told that if he "had taken hold of a plough and worked" by the side of the unfortunate man all would have been well but to sit on his horse and direct Negroes was offensive even to those whose fields were benefited.[56] The same democratic spirit was shown in the constitutions of these Western states. In Alabama, Arkansas, and Texas all male white citizens were granted the right to vote and hold office without property or religious restrictions. In Mississippi where taxes or militia service was at first required for voting and the possession of property and religious faith for officeholding, a second constitution in 1832 wiped these out and added a most emphatic statement regarding the equality of all men.[57]

This democratic flavor did not disappear in the ante-bellum period. The coming of the plantation crowded it aside only to about the same degree that economic and social maturity weakened frontier democracy in the North. Even in 1849 Albert Gallatin Brown could still win wide approval in Mississippi by the boast of being " 'entirely a self-made

[54] *Ibid.*, 479, 490, 496.

[55] *Cong. Debates,* 21 Cong., 1 Sess., 415 (May 5, 1830). For claims associations, etc., see Clarence E. Carter (ed.), *The Territorial Papers of the United States,* Vol. VI, *The Territory of Mississippi, 1809-1817* (Washington, 1938), 598-600, 632. Note also the support given to homestead and pre-emption legislation by Alabama and Mississippi representatives in Congress.

[56] Smedes, *A Southern Planter* (London, 1889), 67. See, also, Wade, *Augustus Baldwin Longstreet,* 5, 59, 61-64.

[57] Francis N. Thorpe (comp.), *The Federal and State Constitutions . . .*, 7 vols. (Washington, 1909), I, 89-114; IV, 2032-62. In speaking of social life in Alabama in the fifties, Miss Boyd says: "Social lines were indefinable then, as now. There was no perceptible division between slaveholders and non-slaveholders as classes. In marriage, in visiting, in professional or other employment no question was raised as to the ownership of slaves or interest in them." Boyd, *Alabama in the Fifties,* 214.

man' " and by accepting "every respectable man as his equal." When the good Dr. Duncan threatened to leave the South in 1860 because he could not approve of secession, the Natchez *Free Trader* informed him that

> brains, not money; principles, not accidental position, rule the people of the South. England is the appropriate place for nabobs, where men bow humbly before Gessler's cap of money, and where lords are invested with every "virtue under heaven." But in the Southern States, men who make 4000 bales of cotton and own 500 negroes have not the influence on that account as the humblest mechanic who advocates correct principles.

A correspondent of this paper a decade earlier had insisted that the safety of the section lay with "her mechanics, her laborers, and her independence but not rich planters."[58] Evidently common men still believed in equality.

It might be possible also, I think, to show that slavery itself was affected by the move into the West. Just as the restless, nonconforming whites tended to get beyond the "hedge" and to drift ultimately to the West, so the rebellious, unsettled Negro found himself sold "down river." In early Western states the runaway advertisements in the newspapers are more numerous, the number of Negroes whose backs are scarred, ears cropped, and breasts branded much greater, indicating, I suggest, not only harder tasks to be performed in the wilderness, and a greater amount of homesickness, but also a habit of running away of long standing. Certainly there were more cases of assault on overseers and masters by slaves, more murders and, in turn, more lynchings of Negroes in the newer states than in the older ones. Slavery was less diffused, and the masters, as one slave complained, "more pushing." Paternalism weakened and the number of slaves whom the master had raised grew smaller. Talk of emancipation was seldom indulged in; the West gave the institution a new hold on the section.[59]

It has been assumed by historians that truly Western conditions existed in the Southern region only in a very early period and that they

[58] James B. Ranck, *Albert Gallatin Brown, Radical Southern Nationalist* (New York, 1937), 60; Natchez *Free Trader,* September, 19, 1860; August 20, 1850.

[59] These conjectures are based on a rather comprehensive survey of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana newspapers for the period.

passed abruptly with the coming of the plantation system. From that time forward, they say, all that was Western ceased to exist. "The South" came into being. In a recent textbook on the West in American history, Dan E. Clark insists that "the concentration on cotton production, with its accompaniment of slave labor, halted the process of frontier development that was normal in other sections." The "Old Southwest" knew the "backwoods pioneer" who "came and went as in other sections of the West," and the "small farmers" who enlarged the clearings. "But here the similarity ended. The cotton planters appeared upon the scene." Lands were exploited by a single crop and then abandoned while the planters moved on to newer regions, there to repeat the same process over and over again.[60] This procedure, says Professor Clark, prevented the completion of the cycle described by J. M. Peck in his *A New Guide for Emigrants to the West.* It missed the last stage in which "men of capital and enterprise" came, bought out the earlier settlers (who, by the way, had cleared the land) and began the development of towns, substantial buildings, "extensive fields, orchards, gardens, colleges and churches" and indulged in "broadclothes, leghorns, crapes and all the refinements, luxuries, elegancies, frivolities and fashions . . . in vogue."

Such an interpretation, and Clark is only the last to repeat it, furnishes only another illustration of the matchless efficiency of abolition propaganda. Historians are still repeating its charges. As a matter of fact the planter and the order which he established meet every requirement of the Peck formula from men "of capital and enterprise" to the "frivolities and fashions." Wheat was as much a single crop in the Northwest as cotton was in the Southwest and gave a depletion of soils which varied only as rainfall and character of sod formation differed. Every student of American agricultural history agrees on that point. Furthermore, the timber, mineral, or grass regions in the Northwest were treated in like fashion. There was nothing unique about what happened under cotton. Nor did the yeoman farmers cease to exist in the Lower South when a handful of planters settled among them. That class—and it did not differ in any essential way from the prosperous

[60] Dan E. Clark, *The West in American History* (New York, 1937), 307-308.

farming class of the Northwest—constituted an overwhelming majority in every Southwestern state to 1860 and increased its acreage and ownership throughout the ante-bellum period.

Furthermore, as nearly as can be determined, the great majority of planters in any given "black belt" were self-made men who achieved their planter status in a single lifetime. In the few regions studied it appears that a majority developed on the spot or came from older Western regions and did not migrate with plantations full-blown from the Atlantic seaboard. A more democratic story does not appear in American history than that offered by the rise of the planter and his large-scale effort in the Southwest. It is a story of hard-working pioneers who bought and sold land, moved along with population streams, and at last "made," as they described it, in some favorable corner. The number who had inherited capital and who brought "great resources" with them to the third stage of this West was no greater than that which came to the Northwest of the same period.

As to the rise of greater complexity in specialized services and in urban centers, it might be suggested that each plantation, something of a town in itself, supplied artisans, industrial laborers, and sometimes even "social workers," while Memphis, New Orleans, Mobile, and a sufficient number of inland towns furnished the commercial, financial, and professional groups. A closer study of the plantation system shows that planters often built their houses in village fashion and actually lived as urban dwellers. The plantation did not always scatter population. In fact, every significant feature of the third "normal western stage" was here to be found. It differed from that of the Northwest only as one West had a right to differ from another.

Thus both in detail and in flavor here was a new West. In essential qualities and temper it differed little from the other Wests of the day and offered the usual contrasts with the older areas from which it had sprung. It was Southern; yet it was thoroughly Western. Its institutions—political, economic, and social—were those of the Old South—the emphasis on county government and officials, the plantation and Negro slavery to a degree, the tradition to aristocracy. Yet the tone and outlook was as Western as that of Illinois—a bit more of indi-

vidualism and equality among men; more of waste and extravagance in the spending of Nature's gifts, more of optimism and more of resentment of privileges. Contemporaries recognized the differences and thought of the Cotton Kingdom as something quite distinct.

Furthermore the region early and late showed a mind of its own in regard to national policies. While the opposition to tariffs in principle and practice was general, the region staunchly supported Andrew Jackson in his stand against nullification. The offer of "treasure and blood" to "preserve inviolate our Constitution and our Union" made by an Alabama meeting, seems to have expressed the feelings of a great majority of the people.[61] On land legislation, representatives of the Western Cotton Kingdom, such as Albert G. Brown, Clement Clay, Franklin Plummer, William R. Smith, Felix McConnell, and W. R. W. Cobb, were as staunch supporters of pre-emption and homestead bills as could be found in all the West. Most of them retained their liberal attitudes until well into the 1850's. And what is more significant, they were as sharply arrayed against the Old South in their land principles as they were against New England itself. For example: When a homestead bill came up for vote in the House, May 12, 1852, thirty-five representatives from the slaveholding states voted in its favor. Thirty of these were from the West. Of the thirty-four votes cast in opposition by the section, twenty-eight were from the seaboard. When the Senate refused to consider homestead legislation, February 21, 1853, twenty of the thirty-three senators who helped to block the bill were from the slaveholding states. Only three of them came from the new Southwest. Even in 1860, Brown of Mississippi could support homesteads with the declaration that he favored "land to the landless and homes to the homeless" regardless of whether they lived in the North or in the South.[62]

East-West differences, moreover, were sometimes hidden by the

[61] Albert B. Moore, *History of Alabama* (University, Ala., 1934), 219-20.

[62] Ranck, *Albert Gallatin Brown,* 59, 135, 190; *Cong. Debates,* 23 Cong., 2 Sess., 1566-70 (Mar. 2, 1835); *Cong. Globe,* 32 Cong., 1 Sess., Appendix, 514, (April 27, 1852); 2 Sess., 747 (Feb. 21, 1853); 33 Cong., 1 Sess., 918 (April 14, 1854). For Brown's entire speech, see *ibid.,* 36 Cong., 1 Sess., 2007 (May 9, 1860). I am indebted to Mr. John L. Harr, one of my graduate students, for assistance in studying the attitudes of Southern congressmen on land legislation.

growing North-South hostility. The expansionist attitude of the Southwest under the pressure for a united front quickly overcame a disposition on the part of the older Southern states to think in terms of land and labor competition, and carried the section into the Texas-Mexican controversy almost as a unit. After a time another influence tended to obscure intra-Southern differences. The increase of political strength and economic resources through cotton gave the Gulf states increasing influence in the slavery struggle and added something more of aggressiveness and self-confidence to the Southern position. Then men talked of "The Cotton Kingdom" as though it constituted the whole South. They ignored dissenting voices. Only the Cotton Kingdom mattered. It thus came about that "King Cotton Diplomacy" was to have been the key to Southern success under Jefferson Davis of Mississippi.

It might thus appear that the Turner approach has a considerably wider application to the ante-bellum South than has usually been supposed. The course of developments was so orthodox that one may well pause in wonderment at the almost total neglect of its story in volumes dealing with "The West in American History." Yet the reasons both for neglect and for the shifting of emphasis to other factors are not difficult to understand. In the first place, the process of evolution from simplicity to complexity which Turner described never went beyond the agricultural stage in the South. The country-gentleman ideal, the development of peculiar marketing arrangements, and the presence of Negro slavery on plantations, checked the development of towns, factories, and industrial captains. The Old South and the Lower South, in spite of efforts to alter the situation, formed a rural-agricultural interest to the outbreak of the War between the States.

Added to this, the slavery controversy emphasized likenesses, not differences, between the old and the new portions of the South. Faced by critics from the outside who called slaveholding a crime and slaveholders, criminals, the whole South moved from resentment to fear. The race question came to form a bond of unity between planter and poor white, between the man from Virginia and the man from Texas.

The enormous variations, produced by major physical divisions, differing times and sources of settlement, competing economic interests, etc., were lost in a common fear of losing the white man's heritage. Sectionalism had characterized the early history of the South. Sectional differences of equal proportions now existed in Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, and the foundations for sharp cleavage between the Old South and the Gulf states were ever-present and often active. Yet in spite of this, the force of the urban-industrial aggressions, soon reinforced by the attack on slavery, pounded these divergent Southern units into what appeared to be a great and distinct section. The normal working out of the Western process was thus hidden under a whole set of artificial creations, and the great American West, North and South, bound together by the Mississippi River system, split unnaturally into two parts. East and West on both sides of Mason and Dixon's line were forced into combinations with units which would normally have been their rivals. The West, therefore, ceased to act as a distinct unit in balancing national life, and failed to make its usual contribution to nationalism and democracy. What that cost the nation and its future no one can say.

Civil war came and ended. Propaganda and bloodshed added their part to sectional hatred. Reconstruction deepened the courses already sharply cut between the sections. Yet the Confederacy, with its capital moved to Richmond, was scarcely able to hold together even in war days, and the so-called "Copperhead" movement in the Northwest constantly threatened the security of Lincoln's government. And when the war and its aftermath had been over long enough to again permit passion to yield to interest, the major truth which stared the American people in the face was that the urban-industrial Northeast had emerged triumphant over all rural-agricultural rivals, and had begun an alliance with the Bourbon elements in the older Southern states for the expansion of their capital and influence to that region. Cotton and wheat farmers of the prewar Wests, North and South, might, hereafter, protest but the power to change things, as earlier Wests had done, had forever passed. That may some day be considered one of America's greatest tragedies.

The Effects of the Civil War on the Louisiana Sugar Industry

By WALTER PRICHARD

Sugar was first successfully manufactured in Louisiana in 1795, and by 1803 it had become the staple crop on a limited number of plantations near New Orleans. Protected by tariff after 1803, sugar culture made notable advances before 1812, when the higher war tariff and the blockade, with resulting increased prices, gave additional stimulus to the industry. The culture of sugar expanded up the Mississippi to Pointe Coupée and westward along bayous Lafourche and Teche in the decade following the importation of hardier varieties of cane and the introduction of steam mills in the early 1820's. The annual yield advanced from 30,000 hogsheads in 1823 to 88,000 in 1828, which figure was not exceeded until 1834, when the crop reached 100,000 hogsheads. Low cotton prices following the panic of 1837, and a more favorable sugar tariff after 1842, resulted in the extension of cane culture to the highlands above Baton Rouge, to the level prairies of the Attakapas and Opelousas regions, and along Red River as far as Natchitoches by the middle 1840's. Many cotton plantations were converted to sugar during the two decades preceding the Civil War, some of the finest ante-bellum sugar plantations being located in this new sugar area. Better drainage and more adequate levee protection against overflows, improved methods of cultivating the cane, more powerful mills for grinding, and more efficient processes of manufacture, kept pace with the rapid expansion of the area of cane culture; and, in spite of numerous handicaps, the

Louisiana sugar industry continued to flourish until almost annihilated by the blight of civil war.[1]

The average annual sugar crop jumped from 77,000 hogsheads for the decade 1832-1841, to 192,000 for the decade 1842-1851, and to 298,000 for the decade 1852-1861. Unfavorable climatic conditions and other unavoidable hazards brought occasional lean years, and the crop fluctuated widely, ranging from 30,000 to 115,000 hogsheads in the decade 1832-1841, from 100,000 to 248,000 in the decade 1842-1851, and from 74,000 to 460,000 in the decade 1852-1861. The crop of 1861 reached 459,410 hogsheads, valued at $25,000,000, which exceeded the bumper crop of 1853 by 10,000 hogsheads and slightly surpassed in value the crop of 1858.[2]

The outbreak of the Civil War found this great industry still advancing, though it had already attained a remarkable status, in spite of tariff uncertainties, climatic disadvantages, flood menaces, and other se-

[1] This brief summary of the ante-bellum sugar industry is based upon information accumulated during fifteen years of research, the bibliography of which it would be manifestly impracticable to cite here in its entirety. Statistics given are from P. A. Champomier's annual *Statement of the Sugar Crop Made in Louisiana* (New Orleans), 1844-1845, 1845-1846, 1849-1850 to 1861-1862; New Orleans *Price-Current,* 1822-1862; *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), I-XXXII (1846-1862).

Champomier's work gives the sugar crops for the years covered, by plantations and parishes, listing the location of each plantation, the type of sugarhouse, and the kind of equipment employed in each. It is a veritable mine of information on the history of the ante-bellum sugar industry. P. A. Degelos issued a few similar annual reports previous to the beginning of the Champomier *Statements*, but extant copies of Degelos' reports are exceedingly rare, and summaries only of most of his reports are to be found in the newspapers of the 1830's, particularly in the New Orleans *Price-Current.* This paper was an outstanding organ of the commercial and agricultural interests of Louisiana, and a vast amount of information on the sugar industry is found in its files. The "Annual Statement," published at the beginning of each commercial season, usually in the issue of September 1, gives a detailed resumé of the sugar crop of the preceding year. *De Bow's Review* devoted a great deal of space to articles and statistics on the sugar industry, but a considerable part of the material printed by it, particularly the statistics of the sugar crop, are derived directly from Champomier's *Statements* or from the *Price-Current.* Both the New Orleans and the Louisiana country newspapers devoted considerable space to this major interest of ante-bellum Louisiana.

[2] Hogshead statistics are computed from the "Table of Annual Yields," in Champomier, *Statement,* 1861-1862. Annual yields for 1823 to 1861, except for the years 1830 and 1831, are also in *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1869* (Washington, 1870), 57. Value of sugar crops are from *De Bow's Review,* After the War Series, II (1866), 416. All subsequent references to this periodical are to this series.

rious hazards which the best management was powerless to eliminate. The percentage of juice extracted from the cane had been gradually increased, the amount of sugar derived from a given quantity of juice had been greatly augmented, the quality of sugar manufactured was improved, and the quantity of molasses per hogshead of sugar was considerably decreased. Only 264 of the 1,291 sugarhouses operating in 1861 employed horsepower, the other 1,027 being operated by steam; and many of the progressive planters had installed the latest and most approved apparatus for the manufacture of sugar.[3]

In 1861 the Louisiana sugar industry represented an investment of $200,000,000, divided as follows: 1,291 sugarhouses with their equipment and other permanent plantation improvements, $56,000,000; lands, $26,000,000; rolling stock, mules, horses, oxen, wagons, carts, and agricultural implements, $13,000,000; and 139,000 slave families, $105,000,000. Many single sugarhouses represented an investment of $100,000; over 1,000 of them averaged $50,000, while the remaining 300 averaged $20,000 in value. The average value of the 1,291 sugar estates was $155,000, while several were valued at over $1,000,000 each.[4] These huge sums invested in sugar culture explain why the uninformed Northern opponents of the sugar tariff commonly referred to the sugar planters as the "Sugar Nabobs of Louisiana."[5] The sugar industry in 1861 thus presented an impressive record of past progress, a most strik-

[3] See Champomier, *Statement,* 1861-1862, p. 39, for information on types of motive power for operating sugarhouses, and his several annual *Statements* for the progress of improvement in apparatus for manufacturing sugar.

[4] Figures from letter of Edmund J. Forstall of New Orleans to David A. Wells, special commissioner of the revenue, printed in full in New Orleans *Price-Current,* May 19, 1866. Statistics contained in this letter are also in *De Bow's Review,* II (1866), 304-306. See, also, *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1874* (Washington, 1875), 108.

Forstall was a prominent ante-bellum sugar planter and a keen student of the sugar industry. Probably none of his contemporaries was better informed than he on that subject; and, discounting his probable bias in favor of a Louisiana industry, his figures may be accepted as substantially correct. At any rate they are the best available on the capital invested in the sugar industry at the outbreak of the Civil War and the losses sustained by that industry as a result of the war.

[5] Numerous instances of the use of this favorite epithet are found in the speeches of Northern congressmen during the tariff debates between 1830 and 1860.

ing example of man's successful conquest of an unfavorable natural environment, in the face of apparently insurmountable obstacles.[6]

Let us now turn to the effects of the Civil War on this great industry. The bumper crop of 1861 was cultivated to maturity, harvested, manufactured, and marketed with little interference from war activities;[7] and all preparations for another huge crop had been made before Federal armies invaded Louisiana's "sugar bowl" in the spring of 1862. Demoralization of plantation Negroes, who regarded Federal troops as their liberators, and the seizure of plantation animals for army use, prevented adequate cultivation of the crop. Scarcity and undependability of labor, shortage of plantation animals, wagons, and carts, wanton destruction of sugarhouses or disabling of their machinery by Federal soldiers or irresponsible Negroes, lack of fuel and necessary chemicals, and the generally unsettled conditions incident to the war, rendered impossible the orderly harvesting and manufacture of the crop, and much cane was left to rot in the fields.[8] These unfavorable condi-

[6] *De Bow's Review,* IV (1867), 236-38; *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1877* (Washington, 1878), 240.

[7] Shortage of extra labor during the grinding season retarded the harvesting and manufacturing of the crop, but the season was extremely favorable and little loss occurred on account of labor shortage. Employment of steamboats in war activities rendered transportation of the crop to market difficult in some instances. Some planters suffered from lack of adequate fuel for sugar manufacture on account of difficulty in obtaining new supplies of coal, but on the whole this factor was of minor importance. The blockade, both on the Mississippi and in the Gulf of Mexico, greatly limited the normal market for Louisiana sugar, thus depressing the price of the article. *De Bow's Review,* II (1866), 416.

[8] For general effects of the war on the sugar crop of 1862 and subsequent years, see Forstall to Wells, in the New Orleans *Price-Current,* May 19, 1866; *De Bow's Review,* I (1866), 49; IV (1867), 236-38. For shortage of plantation wagons and carts, see New Orleans *Times,* November 7, 1865. For shortage of plantation animals, see New Orleans *Bee,* February 20, 1863; New Orleans *Era,* March 18, April 11, 1863; New Orleans *Times,* February 13, March 13, December 28, 1864; January 21, February 5, 24, April 2, June 8, October 1, 15, 20, 28, December 27, 1865; January 24, 26, 1866; New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* August 24 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner,* August 19), 1865. On shortage of fuel, see New Orleans *Era,* December 15, 1863; New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* August 26, November 11, 1864; February 14, 1866; New Orleans *Daily Crescent,* February 19, 1865. On scarcity of chemicals employed in sugar manufacture, see New Orleans *Bee,* January 1, 1863; New Orleans *Era,* October 18, 1863; New Orleans *Times,* November 13, 1864; November 23, 1865. On scarcity of sugar hogsheads and molasses barrels, see New Orleans *Bee,* January 8, November 4, 27, 1863; New Orleans *Era,* January 24, March 20, October 3, 18, 1864; January 9, 27, February 24, June 12, October 1, November 4, 7, 1865; March 16, 1866. Examples of wanton destruction of sugarhouses are noted in *De*

tions combined to reduce the crop of 1862 to 87,000 hogsheads, valued at only $8,000,000.[9]

The inability of the sugar planters to save the crop of 1862 had far-reaching results destructive to the industry. Sugar planters as a class were capitalists, operating largely upon credit advanced by their factors, who in turn discounted this plantation paper with the banks. In 1862 the Louisiana sugar planters owed some $20,000,000 to their New Orleans factors.[10] Thus, the greatly reduced crop of that year ruined planters, factors, and banks alike, and made impossible the financing of another sugar crop, had no other obstacles prevailed. In 1864 only six or seven out of over five hundred ante-bellum New Orleans factors remained in business, and most of the banks were ruined by the events of the war.[11]

With credit annihilated and labor unreliable, many planters despaired of making another sugar crop, and turned to other crops requiring less labor and capital. Attracted by the high prices then prevailing, many planters tried the cultivation of cotton. On account of the blockade, some planted only crops for home consumption. Rice culture was greatly extended in the sugar regions, and corn and vegetables were cultivated on a larger scale than in ante-bellum days. The war, which had cut off supplies from the outside, resulted in greater diversification of crops in the sugar region. A "live at home" policy was generally adopted by sugar planters.[12] Under these conditions little seed cane was planted in

Bow's Review, II (1866), 538; New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* March 8, June 26, 1863; December 23, 1864; August 24, 1865; New Orleans *Era,* November 1, 1863; New Orleans *Times,* September 17, 20, November 18, 1865. Citations on demoralization of the plantation labor resulting from invasion of the sugar regions by Federal armies will be given in connection with labor conditions at the close of the war.

[9] *De Bow's Review,* I (1866), 49.

[10] Forstall to Wells, New Orleans *Price-Current,* May 19, 1866; *De Bow's Review,* II (1866), 416.

[11] New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* September 30, 1864.

[12] On diversion of sugar lands to other crops, see New Orleans *Era,* September 1, December 3, 1863; New Orleans *Times,* January 14, 1864; New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* June 11, 15, July 10, September 30, 1864; February 9, March 14, April 4, 1865. For the increase in rice production in Louisiana resulting from the effects of the war, see Louis Bouchereau, *Statement of the Sugar and Rice Crops Made in Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1868-1877), 1868-1869, *et seq.; Report of the Tariff Commission, Appointed Under Act of Congress Approved May 15, 1882,* 2 vols. (Washington, 1882), II, 2537-41.

1862, and most of the sugar crop of 1863 was produced from the ratoons. Some planters sold their standing cane in the field, on account of their inability to command the labor and capital necessary to manufacture their crops into sugar. In spite of all these difficulties the sugar crop of 1863 yielded 77,000 hogsheads, which at the high prices then prevailing was valued at $14,000,000.[13]

Few planters tried to make a sugar crop in 1864. Many even plowed up what cane they had and planted cotton, rice, or some other crop requiring less labor and capital than sugar culture.[14] The ratoons, which had produced most of the crop of 1863, were running out, and little or no seed cane was planted to replace them.[15] Many planters were so discouraged that they planned to grind what little cane they had and then abandon the culture entirely. The future outlook for the sugar industry was then so serious that General Nathaniel P. Banks ordered all sugar planters to reserve one fourth of their cane crop of 1864 for seed.[16] This requirement reduced the amount of cane available for making sugar, thus bringing the crop of 1864 down to 10,000 hogsheads, valued at only $2,000,000, in spite of the prevailing high prices for sugar.[17] This small yield was hardly sufficient to supply the needs of New Orleans, and much Cuban sugar was imported for local consumption.[18] The meager crop of 1864 was produced by only 175 sugarhouses located in sixteen parishes, which in 1861 had 1,090 sugarhouses in operation, producing 400,000 hogsheads. Eight other sugar parishes, which in 1861 had 201 sugarhouses in operation, making 60,000 hogsheads, made no sugar at all in 1864.[19] The Louisiana sugar industry was at its lowest ebb at the beginning of 1865.

When preparations should have been made for the sugar crop of

[13] *De Bow's Review,* I (1866), 49; II (1866), 416.

[14] See n. 12, above.

[15] *De Bow's Review,* I (1866), 49; II, (1866), 416.

[16] General Orders, No. 138, dated New Orleans, September 22, 1864, published in full in New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* New Orleans *Times,* and New Orleans *Era,* September 28, 1864.

[17] *De Bow's Review,* I (1866), 49; II (1866), 416.

[18] New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* May 24, June 18, 26, July 7, August 2, 1864.

[19] Figures compiled from table in the "Annual Statement," in New Orleans *Price-Current,* September 1, 1866.

1865, the war was still on, plantation labor was scarce and unreliable, credit facilities were lacking, and the planters were discouraged; and when the war closed it was too late in the season to expand the sugar crop of that year. Thanks to General Banks' seed cane order, more cane was cultivated in 1865 than in 1864, but much of the crop of that year was reserved for seed, the demand for which was unusual.[20] Cotton prices dropped sharply after the war closed, the lowlands of the sugar regions had proved unsuited to cotton, and there was a rush to return to sugar culture as soon as possible.[21] Many planters found it more profitable to sell their cane crop of 1865 for seed, the price of which had advanced to $150 per arpent.[22] Had labor and capital been available and the price of seed cane not been almost prohibitive, it is possible that all the crop of 1865 might have been planted rather than manufactured into sugar. Many planters also made only molasses in that year, in order to escape the Federal excise tax of three cents per pound on sugar.[23] Under these conditions only 188 sugarhouses were in operation in 1865, producing 18,000 hogsheads, valued at only $3,000,000, with the drop in sugar prices following the war.[24]

Before considering the movement to revive the prostrated sugar industry, it may be enlightening to view the war losses sustained by that interest. These losses, exclusive of lands and slaves, were estimated at $70,000,000. Figures previously cited place the slave loss at $105,000,000. Louisiana lands depreciated in value more than those of any other

[20] On the great demand for seed cane for the crop of 1865, see New Orleans *Times,* September 23, 29, October 1, 8, 12, 27, November 13, 1864; January 12, 1865; New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* February 10, 11, 1865.

[21] New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* September 30, October 1, 1864; February 9, March 15, April 4, 1865.

[22] New Orleans *Times,* August 6, 8, September 7, 8, October 1, November 9, December 27, 1865; Carrollton *Daily Southern Star,* October 1, November 16, 1865; New Orleans *Bee,* November 8, 1865.

[23] For the heavy burden which this excise tax imposed upon the sugar industry, see *De Bow's Review,* I (1866), 658; New Orleans *Era,* June 16, 1863; New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* June 17, 1863; March 17, 1866; New Orleans *Times,* July 10, 31, 1865; March 17, 1866; Carrollton *Daily Southern Star,* March 18, 1866; New Orleans *Price-Current,* February 21, 24, May 19, 1866.

[24] "Annual Statement," in New Orleans *Price-Current,* September 1, 1866; *De Bow's Review,* II (1866), 416.

Southern state between 1860 and 1865, the decrease being estimated at 70 per cent, making a loss of $18,000,000 on sugar lands. These losses make a total of $193,000,000 on an investment of $200,000,000, amounting to almost complete annihilation.[25] Every sugar planter who could held on tenaciously to his ruined estate, hoping to rebuild his shattered fortune.[26] But many sugar plantations had been heavily mortgaged at the outbreak of the war, and when the war ended a general liquidation ensued. Sugar plantations sold as low as from 6 to 10 per cent of their prewar value, many bringing less than the original cost of their sugarhouse machinery, and far less than the proceeds of their sugar crop of 1861. Many formerly opulent sugar planters were dispossessed and financially ruined, their plantations passing into new hands, the purchasers acquiring the neglected lands and dilapidated buildings and equipment for a small cash outlay.[27]

Planters fortunate enough to retain their estates found their sugarhouses and machinery destroyed or rendered useless by vandalism or the ravages of the elements during the years of disuse and neglect; plantation ditches filled up or overgrown with weeds, briars, and shrubs; drainage machines destroyed or useless until repaired; levees broken in many places and requiring extensive repairs before a crop could be planted with safety; plantation fences missing, consumed as firewood by Federal soldiers or Negroes; plantation animals gone, and rolling stock and agricultural implements missing or worn out; existing buildings in a disheartening state of disrepair; and the part of the ante-bellum labor force remaining on the plantation demoralized and

[25] The decrease in land values in the Southern states after 1860 is estimated at 70 per cent for Louisiana, 65 per cent for Mississippi, 60 per cent for Alabama and South Carolina, 55 per cent for Georgia, Florida, and Arkansas, 50 per cent for North Carolina, 28 per cent for Texas, 27 per cent for Virginia, and 18 per cent for Tennessee, in *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1867* (Washington, 1868), 119. Detailed information on depreciation in Louisiana is found in *ibid.*, 106, 114, and in *De Bow's Review,* III (1867), 474.

[26] "The Planter is yet holding tenaciously to his wrecked Estate, destitute of the means to work it." Forstall to Wells, in New Orleans *Price-Current,* May 19, 1866.

[27] For a few representative sales of fine sugar estates after the war, see New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* April 28, May 13, 1865; February 14, 1866; New Orleans *Times,* March 13, 1866; New Orleans *Price-Current,* September 1, 1865; *De Bow's Review,* III (1867), 308.

rendered irresponsible by the effects of the war and the Freedmen's Bureau regulations.[28] It took a stout heart to undertake the rehabilitation of a plantation reduced to such a ruined condition.

But a surprising note of optimism was prevalent among sugar planters at the close of the war. They were inclined to look toward the future rather than to pine for the good old days.[29] Two factors were essential to the rehabilitation of their plantations: capital and labor. The former was almost unprocurable immediately after the war. The little local capital available was absorbed by the reviving commerce of the region. Banks preferred to lend their limited capital on short-term commercial

[28] For information on the demoralized condition of the sugar industry at the close of the war, see New Orleans *Times,* March 26, April 2, 28, May 30, June 1, 12, 27, 29, July 6, 10, 15, 18, 23, August 5, 12 (quoting St. Martinville *Courier of the Teche*), 16, 30, September 6 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), 17, 20, October 9, 15, 27, November 18, 23, 1865; New Orleans *Bee,* March 25, August 29 (quoting Plaquemine *Iberville South*), September 12, 26, December 28 (quoting Baton Rouge *Advocate*), 1865; New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* January 25, March 15, July 22, August 11 (quoting St. Martinville *Courier of the Teche*), 24 (quoting Franklin *Planter's Banner*), December 28 (quoting Baton Rouge *Advocate*), 1865; New Orleans *Price-Current,* July 21, September 1, October 4, 7, 11, 21 (quoting Pointe-a-la-Hache *Empire Parish*), December 23 (quoting Pointe Coupée *Echo*), 1865; Carrollton *Daily Southern Star,* September 7 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), October 8, December 29 (quoting Baton Rouge *Advocate*), 1865; West Baton Rouge *Sugar Planter,* March 24, April 21, September 22, October 20, 27, 1866; *De Bow's Review,* I (1866), 49; II (1866), 416; III (1867), 170; IV (1867), 474; V (1868), 461; *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1867,* pp. 100-101; *1874,* p. 108; *1877,* pp. 34-44; Randell Hunt, *An Appeal in Behalf of Louisiana, to the Senate of the United States, for the Fulfillment of the Constitutional Guarantee to Her of a Republican Form of Government, as a State in the Union* (New Orleans, 1874), 6-7; Theodore S. Wilkinson, *The Sugar Question, with Certain Allegations on the Subject Considered. . . . Speech . . . in House of Representatives, Monday, July 9, 1888* (Washington, 1888), 6.

The country editors took the lead in the publication of articles on the condition of the sugar industry following the war, and most of the New Orleans editors gleaned their information from their country exchanges, though some of them had firsthand knowledge of conditions. The ablest of the country editors was Daniel Dennett of the Franklin *Planters' Banner.* After its revival, following the close of the war, the West Baton Rouge *Sugar Planter,* edited by Henry M. Hyams, lived up to its name by devoting a large amount of space to conditions of the sugar industry. Other country editors did their bit in the attempt to encourage rehabilitation of the Louisiana "Sugar Bowl." Complete or even partial files of very few of these post-bellum country papers are extant, and the chief source for information published in most of them is excerpts copied by the contemporary New Orleans papers. The material available on this large subject is voluminous, and only selected samples of it are cited here.

[29] For evidences of this optimism of sugar planters immediately following the war, see Carrollton *Daily Southern Star,* November 16 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), 22

paper. This type of credit was unsatisfactory to sugar planters, who must have long-term credit, which was obtainable only at interest rates ranging from 10 to 15 per cent, with real estate at greatly reduced valuations as security. Such credit was not available to many planters, and they were forced to proceed slowly in their rehabilitation operations, working largely on a cash basis, which was their only recourse under existing circumstances.[30] It was estimated in 1865 that $26,000,000, if made available at once, would enable sugar planters to resume cane culture on a small scale: $13,000,000 to replace plantation animals, rolling stock, agricultural implements, sugarhouse equipment, etc., and $13,000,000 as advances for labor and supplies necessary in making a sugar crop. An appeal was made to the Federal government for a loan of the above sum, but the appeal met with no response.[31] The ruined sugar interest had little attraction for private capitalists as a field for safe investment. Inability to procure needed capital delayed the recovery of the sugar industry.[32]

The solution of the labor problem was another obstacle confronting

(quoting Houma *Civic Guard*), 1865; January 26 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), February 5 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), 20 (quoting West Baton Rouge *Sugar Planter*), 24 (quoting Plaquemine *Iberville South*), 1866; New Orleans *Times,* November 19, 1865 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*); February 19, 1866 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*); New Orleans *Price-Current,* November 25 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), December 23 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), 1865; West Baton Rouge *Sugar Planter,* October 13, 20 (quoting Plaquemine *Iberville South*), 27, November 10, 1866.

[30] On scarcity of local capital and the general derangement in banking and credit facilities at the close of the war, see New Orleans *Times,* July 10, September 6 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), October 27, November 23, December 3, 6, 31, 1865; January 1, 1866; Carrollton *Daily Southern Star,* September 7, 1865 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*); New Orleans *Price-Current,* September 1, 1865; September 1, 1866; "Reports of the Majority and Minority of the Financial Commission of New Orleans, under Special Orders No. 69, Issued by Major General N. P. Banks, Commanding Department of the Gulf, under Date of March 18, 1864," in *Report of the Auditor of Public Accounts to the General Assembly of the State of Louisiana, September 30, 1864* (New Orleans, 1864); "Report of the Attorney General," in *Legislative Documents of Louisiana,* 1864, pp. 195-200; "Report of the Board of Currency," *ibid.,* 218-20.

[31] For estimate of capital needed immediately to rehabilitate the sugar industry, and appeal to the Federal government for an advance of this amount, see Forstall to Wells, in New Orleans *Price-Current,* May 19, 1866.

[32] *De Bow's Review,* I (1866), 220; IV (1867), 236-38; V (1868), 882; Robert M. Davis, *The Southern Planter, the Factor and the Banker* (New Orleans, 1871); *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1873* (Washington, 1874), 109-11.

the sugar planters. At first they hoped to find a way to utilize the free labor of their former slaves in sugar culture.[33] Contrary to accepted tradition, Negroes who were accustomed to cane culture preferred it to cotton culture.[34] But if a steady and dependable labor supply could not be had, the revival of cane culture on the ante-bellum scale was not possible. When planters undertook, in the fall of 1865, to make contracts with freedmen for 1866 the "forty acres and a mule" idea was abroad, and the Negroes refused to make contracts.[35] The state legislature took steps to make labor available to the planters, but this legislation aroused the ire of the uninformed Northern radicals, which caused the plan to fail.[36] Even if it had been possible to restore to the plantations all Negroes accustomed to sugar culture in ante-bellum days, the labor supply would still have been far short of the demand, on account of the great

[33] On the experiences of sugar planters with free Negro labor, see New Orleans *Bee,* February 20, 1863; September 26, 1865; New Orleans *Era,* April 2, 11, December 3, 5, 15, 25, 1863; New Orleans *Times,* February 16, 25, June 1, July 23, September 20, 1865; February 19, 1866 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*); New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* August 11, 1865; Carrollton *Daily Southern Star,* October 8, November 22, December 14, 1865; New Orleans *Price-Current,* October 21, 1865; Opelousas *Courier,* January 27 (quoting Baton Rouge *Advocate*), February 17 (quoting New Orleans *Daily True Delta*), 1866; West Baton Rouge *Sugar Planter,* March 10, 1866; *De Bow's Review,* I (1866), 220; II (1866), 436-39; III (1867), 100-101, 200-201, 332-33; VI (1869), 85-92; VIII (1870), 168-69; report of Carl Schurz who visited the Louisiana sugar region in the fall of 1865, *Senate Executive Documents,* 39 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 2, pp. 84-88, 92-96; "Report of P. H. Sheridan, Major General United States Army, to Major General O. O. Howard, Commissioner, &c., Washington, D. C., dated Headquarters Bureau Refugees, etc., State of Louisiana, New Orleans, Louisiana, October 31, 1866," *ibid.,* 2 Sess., No. 6, pp. 70-72, 74, 84-87.

[34] West Baton Rouge *Sugar Planter,* October 13, 20 (quoting Plaquemine *Iberville South*), 1866; *De Bow's Review,* I (1866), 659.

[35] On the reluctance of freedmen to make contracts and their inefficiency and undependability when they were employed, see New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* September 1 (quoting Baton Rouge *Gazette and Comet*), October 13 (quoting Thibodaux *Sentinel*), 1863; January 23, 1864; New Orleans *Bee,* October 14, 19, November 10, 1863; New Orleans *Era,* October 17 (quoting Thibodeaux *Sentinel*), November 8, 1863; November 22, 1864; New Orleans *Times,* April 28, June 29, 1865; Carrollton *Daily Southern Star,* December 14, 1865; January 18 (quoting Houma *Civic Guard*), February 24 (quoting Plaquemine *Iberville South*), 1866; *De Bow's Review,* III (1867), 332-33; VI (1869), 85-92; VIII (1870), 168-69; "Report of P. H. Sheridan," in *loc. cit.,* 84-88; report of Carl Schurz, in *loc. cit.,* 84-88.

[36] For the movement to regulate the labor of freedmen by statute, see New Orleans *Price-Current,* November 4, 11, 22, 25, December 2, 20, 1865; January 6, February 24, 1866. For the text of these laws to regulate freedmen, commonly called the "New Black Code," see Louisiana *Laws,* Extra Sess., 1865, Nos. 10, 11, 12, 16, 19, 20, pp. 14-20,

mortality among the Negroes during the war.[37] Until the freedmen learned that their freedom meant "freedom to work" it was unsafe to rely upon this type of labor for sugar culture, and the planters turned their attention to schemes for inducing white laborers from the North and West and from Europe to come to the sugar regions. The Louisiana State Bureau of Immigration, established in 1866, and numerous private and corporate agencies took up the work. But the Northern press was hostile at this time, the sugar regions had a false reputation for insalubrity, and the free lands and the expanding industries of the West and North had greater attractions than the cane fields of Louisiana for white laborers. A small number of German, Irish, and other immigrants were procured, but on the whole the plan to supplant the Negro with white labor on the sugar plantations was not a success.[38]

24-26, 28-32; *Acts of the General Assembly of Louisiana, Relating to Labor, Extra Session, 1865, Printed by Order of the House of Representatives* (New Orleans, 1866). The latter reference also contains Act No. 58, which was not approved by the Governor. This proposed act, which was the most obnoxious of the lot to the Northern radicals, was included along with the others in the report of O. O. Howard, major general and commissioner, to E. M. Stanton, secretary of war, on "Freedmen's Affairs," dated Washington, December 21, 1866, in *Senate Executive Documents,* 39 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 6, pp. 181-87. For Louisiana's defense of these measures to regulate freedmen, see "Report of the Senate Committee on Federal Relations," and "Report of the Commissioners Appointed by the General Assembly to Proceed to Washington, to Wait on Andrew Johnson, President of the United States," in *Legislative Documents of Louisiana,* 1866.

[37] New Orleans *Times,* November 19, 1865 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*); New Orleans *Price-Current,* December 30, 1865; *De Bow's Review,* IV (1867), 236-38; VI (1869), 85-92.

[38] On the movement for inducing white laborers to come into the sugar regions, the activities of the Louisiana Bureau of Immigration, and private agencies in this work, see New Orleans *Bee,* February 1, 1864; November 25, December 4, 7, 1865; New Orleans *Times,* April 9, September 1, 28, 1864; May 30, June 12, July 24, August 16, October 5, 15, November 23, December 29 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), 1865; January 24, February 10, March 14 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), 1866; New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* August 9, 26, September 28, 1864; March 15, 1865; Carrollton *Daily Southern Star,* December 5, 20 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), 29 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), 1865; West Baton Rouge *Sugar Planter,* February 10, October 27 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), 1866; *De Bow's Review,* I (1866), 213-14; II (1866), 274-85; IV (1867), 468-76, 575-76; V (1868), 211, 297-308, 327-29, 363-72; VIII (1870), 154; "Report of the Auditor of Public Accounts," in *Louisiana Legislative Documents,* 1864, Appendix, "Report of State Officers," 84; "Communication from His Excellency, J. Madison Wells, Governor of Louisiana, in Relation to Immigration, and the Establishment of a Bureau of Arts and Agriculture in Connection Therewith," in *Legislative Documents of Louisiana,* 1866; *Report of Thomas Cottman, Chief of the Bureau of Immigration for the State of Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1866); *Report of the Bureau*

The planters next turned to plans for bringing coolies from India and China to the Louisiana sugar regions. Quite a number of coolies were brought in, and they were regarded as steady and dependable laborers.[39] But the ensuing struggle of the Negroes for political and social equality made it seem undesirable to import other inferior races to complicate further the already troublesome race problem confronting the whites of Louisiana. Moreover, when the freedmen learned that the "forty acres and a mule" donation expected from the Federal government was not forthcoming, many of them returned to plantation labor and were again the chief reliance for a labor supply on the sugar plantations,[40] except during the harvest season, when additional white laborers were employed to assist in taking off the crop.

of Immigration to the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, 1867 (New Orleans, 1867); "Annual Report of J. C. Kathman, Chief of the Bureau of Immigration, to the General Assembly of Louisiana, July 1, 1868," in *Legislative Documents of Louisiana,* 1868; "Report of the Bureau of Immigration to the General Assembly," *ibid.,* 1869; "Memorial and Explorations of the Hon. J. B. Robertson, in Relation to the Agricultural, Mineral, and Manufacturing Resources of the State; with the Report of the Joint Committee," *ibid.,* 1867, reprinted in "Report of the Bureau of Immigration, 1868; Report of Edward Gottheil, Chief Commissioner and General Agent from the State of Louisiana to the Paris Universal Exposition of 1867, Made to the Governor and General Assembly, Session of 1868," *ibid.,* 1868; *The Louisiana Immigration and Homestead Company: Reasons for Subscribing, and Charter of the Association* (New Orleans, 1873); *Circular of Messrs. John Williams and Charles Nathan* (New Orleans, 1880), offering to contract with planters to bring in European farm labor; H. Thompson Brown, *Ascension Parish, Louisiana; Her Resources, Advantages and Attractions: A Description of the Parish and the Inducements Offered to Those Seeking New Homes* (Donaldsonville, 1880), "Prepared at the Instance of the Ascension Branch Sugar Planters' Association of Louisiana, and Published by the Police Jury of Ascension Parish"; *Resources of Vermilion Parish, Southwest Louisiana, Issued by the Louisiana Land and Development Company, Ltd., Abbeville, Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1894). William H. Harris, *Louisiana: Produkte, Resourcen und Attractionen* (New Orleans, 1885), is an example of immigration literature designed to attract Germans to the sugar regions. Harris was commissioner of immigration for Louisiana. *Lands and Plantations Belonging to the Citizens' Bank of Louisiana, Offered for Sale or Rent on Favorable Terms* (New Orleans, 1876), is a good example of private appeals to those interested in settling in the sugar regions.

[39] On importation of coolies into the sugar region and experiments with such labor, see New Orleans *Times,* June 27, July 6, 1865; Opelousas *Courier,* December 9 (quoting New Orleans *Picayune*), 16 (quoting New Orleans *Bee*), 23, 1865; February 17, 1866 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*); West Baton Rouge *Sugar Planter,* February 10, 1866; *De Bow's Review,* I (1866), 224; II (1866), 215-17; IV (1867), 160, 362-63; VI (1869), 525; VII (1869), 630; *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1873,* p. 109.

[40] On the return of the freedmen to the sugar plantations, see Carrollton *Daily Southern*

But hired labor, of whatever type, proved more expensive than antebellum slave labor in sugar cultivation, and planters were forced to adopt new methods of cultivation in order to reduce their labor costs. Confronted with this pressing problem the sugar planters largely abandoned the hoe culture, which had been a striking feature of the antebellum gang system, and introduced mule-drawn, laborsaving agricultural implements.[41] They also turned their attention to better drainage of their lands, crop rotation, more careful selection of seed cane, and the use of commercial fertilizers, in order to increase the yield of cane per acre. One of the chief items in the cost of cane culture was the labor employed in tending the crop, and it cost no more to cultivate an acre of rank cane than an acre of scrawny cane. Thus, in the course of time sugar planters largely overcame the postwar handicap of scarcity of plantation hands and the higher cost of free labor.[42]

Star, December 20, 1865 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*); New Orleans *Daily True Delta,* December 29, 1865; New Orleans *Price-Current,* October 25, December 23 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), 1865; West Baton Rouge *Sugar Planter,* March 31, April 21, 1866.

[41] For abandonment of hand tillage and the introduction of laborsaving equipment for cultivating the cane, see "The Cultivation of Sugar Cane and the Manufacture of Sugar," in *American Sugar Manual* (Buffalo, 1870), 26, a circular of the American Cane Machinery, manufactured by George L. Squier & Brother. Lack of capital for purchasing improved equipment and the fact that the Negroes were accustomed to hoe culture and did not take readily to the use of improved equipment retarded progress in this respect.

[42] For improvement in sugar agriculture by adoption of better and more scientific methods in growing sugar cane, see *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1867,* pp. 279-80; *1869,* pp. 297-98; *1873,* pp. 109-11; *1877,* pp. 21-24; *1878,* p. 7; *1886,* p. 330; *1889,* pp. 527-28; *1891,* pp. 517-18; *1892,* pp. 19, 151; *De Bow's Review,* VI (1869), 517-25; VII (1870), 100, 500-502; Guilford L. Spencer, "Report of Experiments in the Manufacture of Sugar at Magnolia Station, Lawrence, Louisiana, Season of 1885-'86: Second Report," in Department of Agriculture, Division of Chemistry, *Bulletin No. 11* (Washington, 1886); Louis Bouchereau, *Statement of the Sugar and Rice Crops Made in Louisiana,* 1868-1877; Alcée Bouchereau, *Statement of the Sugar and Rice Crops Made in Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1877-1892), 1877-1878, *et seq.; Proceedings of the Louisiana Sugar Planters' Association* (New Orleans, 1885-1889), published as pamphlets and reports, but its activities are found earlier in New Orleans newspapers before regular *Proceedings* were printed; *Louisiana Planter and Sugar Manufacturer* (New Orleans, 1888-1929). This last publication appeared weekly and was the official organ of the Louisiana Sugar Planters' Association, Ascension Branch Sugar Planters' Association, Louisiana Sugar Chemists' Association, Kansas Sugar Growers' Association, and the Texas Sugar Planters' Association. The Bouchereau *Statements* and the official organs of the Sugar Planters' associations are the most reliable sources for the study of rehabilitation and progress of the post-bellum sugar industry.

As necessary capital was slowly accumulated the planters also attacked the problem of expressing from the cane the maximum quantity of juice, and of manufacturing the maximum quantity and the best possible quality of sugar from a given amount of cane juice. More powerful mills were installed in the sugarhouses by all the more progressive planters, and the vacuum pan, the centrifugal, and other improved equipment was utilized in the manufacture of sugar.[43] But only a planter of wealth could afford the enormous outlays for such equipment, and the small sugar planter began to turn his attention to sugar agriculture, thus leaving the manufacture of sugar to the capitalist who owned and controlled the expensive manufacturing equipment. This and other changes in the sugar industry gradually brought about the almost complete separation of the agricultural from the manufacturing phase of sugar production, which is a striking feature of the Louisiana sugar industry today.[44]

One of the chief obstacles to the revival of sugar culture immediately following the war was the bad condition of the levees, on which the sugar planters depended for protection of their crops against inundation. To repair the crevasses then existing, an expenditure of at least $625,000 was required. The planters were unable to stand this expense, and the ante-bellum system of holding each abutting plantation owner responsible for maintenance of the levees in front of his property was now untenable. Maintenance of the levees was recognized as a state problem and in 1866 the state relieved the planters of this heavy burden. The Federal government was requested to repair the damage done to the

[43] For the progress of improvement in sugar manufacture by introduction of better machinery and employment of more scientific methods, see authorities cited in n. 42, above; *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1873,* pp. 109-11; *1884,* pp. 12, 34-42; *1885,* pp. 11, 123-38; *1886,* pp. 18, 327-41; *1887,* pp. 254-81; *1888,* pp. 24, 249, 253-54, 263-64, 273-78; *1889,* pp. 19-20, 149-51, 162; *1890,* pp. 15, 294, 511.

[44] On the movement for dividing the great sugar estates into small farms, and the gradual separation of sugar agriculture from sugar manufacture, see authorities cited in ns. 42, 43, above; *De Bow's Review,* III (1867), 332-33; IV (1867), 236-38; V (1868), 882; VII (1870), 108-109; *American Sugar Manual,* 1870, p. 3; *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1869,* p. 435; *1878,* p. 275; William C. Stubbs, *A Hand-Book of Louisiana, Giving Geographical and Agricultural Features, Together with Crops That Can be Grown . . .* (New Orleans, 1895).

Louisiana levees by the Federal armies, but the request was denied, and it was not until 1882 that the Federal government lent a hand in levee maintenance and flood control. Until Federal assistance was forthcoming the state struggled with the levee problem, more of the funds appropriated for the purpose doubtless going into the pockets of corrupt Carpetbag politicians than into actual levee construction.[45]

In view of the many difficulties confronting the sugar planters it is truly remarkable that the industry was rehabilitated as rapidly as it was, particularly when the political strife of Carpetbagger reconstruction days, which kept the freedmen in a state of unrest and retarded the investment of outside capital in the sugar industry, is considered. Sugar planters were for a decade left mainly to their own resources, but their inherent courage and indomitable spirit gradually brought results. The number of sugarhouses in operation jumped from 175 in 1864 and 188 in 1865 to 329 in 1866, 653 in 1867, 673 in 1868, 817 in 1869, 1,105 in 1870, and 1,224 in 1873. The number then began to decline because of the proven inefficiency of the smaller ones, the absorption of smaller plantations by larger ones, and the advent of the movement for establishing central sugar factories, with the progress of the separation of the agricultural from the manufacturing phase of the industry.[46]

[45] On the levee problem in general and the effect of bad levees upon the rehabilitation of the sugar industry, see *Report of the Board of Levee Commissioners, Together with Reports of the Chief Engineers of the First and Second Division Louisiana Levees* (New Orleans, 1866); also in *Legislative Documents of Louisiana,* 1866; "Report of the State Engineer," *ibid.,* 1867; *Annual Report of the Board of Levee Commissioners to the Legislature of the State of Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1867); "Memorial to the Legislature by the Board of Levee Commissioners on the Employment of Convict Labor," in *Legislative Documents of Louisiana,* 1867; *Report of the Board of Levee Commissioners of the State of Louisiana, from May 10, 1867, to July 27, 1868* (New Orleans, 1868), containing also as an appendix, pp. 55-70, "Acts of the Legislature in Relation to the General Levee System," comprising fourteen laws passed between December 22, 1865, and June 29, 1867, illustrating the volume of such legislation after the war; Louisiana *Laws, passim,* for texts of levee laws; *De Bow's Review,* III (1867), 469-73; V (1868), 162-67; VIII (1870), 170; *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1869,* p. 56; *1877,* pp. 28-29; *1878,* pp. 275-76; *1879,* pp. 6-7; New Orleans *Times,* April 2, October 9, 1865; New Orleans *Price-Current,* October 4, 7, 11, 1865; Carrollton *Daily Southern Star,* December 31, 1865; West Baton Rouge *Sugar Planter,* 1866-1870, *passim.* Other Louisiana newspapers of the period contain many articles on the levee problem. For an exact computation of losses to sugar planters from high waters and crevasses in certain years, see Alcée Bouchereau, *Statement of the Sugar and Rice Crops Made in Louisiana in 1881-82,* xliii, xlvi.

[46] Statistics on sugarhouses for years given are compiled from *De Bow's Review,* I

Scarcity of capital following the war led sugar planters to make a trial of the so-called portable mills, which had come into such wide use in the sorghum industry in the North. The number of such establishments in operation grew from eight in 1868 to ninety in 1871, after which the number gradually decreased. The number of horsepower mills also increased from 133 in 1868 to 317 in 1871, and then gradually decreased, cane growers finding it more profitable to sell their cane to the more efficient sugarhouses. Open kettles for boiling the cane juice gradually gave way to open pans, and then to vacuum pans.[47]

At the close of the war there was much talk of breaking up the large sugar estates into smaller tracts, on the basis of the "forty acres and a mule" idea. Experienced sugar planters opposed this scheme, and held that it was as impracticable to try to rehabilitate the sugar industry by dividing the sugar lands into small tracts as it would be to expect a New England cotton manufacturer to make as large a product by operating a number of "one-horse" mills as by concentrating the same amount of capital and labor in one central establishment. There was the problem of maintenance of an expensive levee system, the responsibility for the extensive drainage system, and the large capital investment in the sugarhouse on the plantation. It was maintained that a number of small proprietors would be unable to co-operate successfully in sugar culture and manufacture. While there were a few cases of division of the large sugar plantations into small tracts, the consummation of this plan on a large scale had to await the establishment of central sugarhouses in the second decade after the war, when the agricultural and manufacturing phases of the sugar industry began to be separated.[48]

With the progress of the industry under the impulse of the innovations previously mentioned, the sugar yield moved steadily upward following the war, though with considerable fluctuations, from 18,070 hogsheads in 1865 to 41,000 in 1866, 84,256 in 1868, 144,881 in 1870,

(1866), 201; II (1866), 417; IV (1867), 239; Louis Bouchereau, *Statements*; "Annual Statements," in New Orleans *Price-Current,* September 1, 1870; September 1, 1871.

[47] Statistics from Louis Bouchereau, *Statements*. Also given in *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1876* (Washington, 1877), 157.

[48] Louis and Alcée Bouchereau, *Statements*. Also authorities listed in n. 44, above.

169,331 in 1876, 218,314 in 1880, and 241,220 in 1882. It continued to increase until it reached 476,379 hogsheads in 1893—when the yield for the first time exceeded the bumper crop of 1861—and 568,622 in 1894, which was the largest crop produced before the turn of the century.[49] The average crops for the three decades following the end of the war were: 1866-1875, 98,000 hogsheads; 1876-1885, 188,000; and 1886-1895, 345,000. It is thus seen that the average yield for the decade 1866-1875 was 21,000 hogsheads greater than that for 1832-1841; that of 1876-1885 was 4,000 less than that for 1842-1851; and that of 1886-1895 was 47,000 greater than that of 1852-1861.[50] This period of three decades following the Civil War had brought many changes in the sugar industry while it was undergoing the process of rehabilitation. The bumper crop of 1894 was produced by only 449 sugarhouses, only three of which were operated by horsepower; and only 72 sugarhouses used open kettles in that year, 143 open pans, while the number employing vacuum pans had increased to 234.[51]

In conclusion it may be stated that the Civil War almost annihilated the Louisiana sugar industry, and the lack of available capital and the scarcity of labor seriously retarded its rehabilitation. But, building upon ante-bellum experience, the industry staged a slow but gradual comeback, and by the time the annual production had again attained the prewar level the cultivation of the cane and the manufacture of sugar were both managed on a more scientific basis. It seems certain that the results of the third decade following the war might have been attained at the end of one decade, had not the turbulent days of reconstruction intervened.

[49] Statistics of crops for 1865 and 1866 are from *De Bow's Review,* II (1866), 417; IV (1867), 239; those for 1868, 1870, and 1876 are from Louis Bouchereau, *Statements*; and those for 1880 and subsequent years are from Alcée Bouchereau, *Statements*. Figures for latter years are given in pounds instead of hogsheads, and these have been converted into hogsheads to make them conform with the figures for the earlier years.

[50] Averages for decades preceding the war are calculated from figures in Champomier, *Statement of the Sugar Crop Made in Louisiana,* 1844-1862; those following the war are computed from sources listed in n. 49, above.

[51] Alcée Bouchereau, *Statement of the Sugar and Rice Crops Made in Louisiana in 1894-'95, passim.*

Cultural Factors in the History of the South

By RICHARD H. SHRYOCK

Interpretations of general history or of historical sociology[1] may proceed in terms of three major factors which influence the life of any people; namely, their biological nature, the particular culture they possess, and the physical environment in which they find themselves.[2] Each of these determinants, the biological, the cultural, and the geographical, is logically distinct from the others and together they seem to represent the only fundamental factors which are so distinct, unless one has faith in such forces as individual caprice or direct supernatural influence. It is possible to view other traditional interpretations of history as resolving themselves into an emphasis upon special phases of one of these factors, or else as involving a combination of two or more of them. Thus a stressing of religious influences may be viewed as featuring one aspect of cultural determinism; while an economic interpretation combines elements of a cultural and of a geographical nature. Again, any special theme which has been employed as a "guiding thread" through the historical maze—for example, nationalism, colonialism, democracy, the frontier—may be broken down into these more fundamental elements.[3]

[1] This paper was read at a meeting of the Southern Historical Association at New Orleans, November 4, 1938.

[2] It is not desirable to stress the traditional distinctions between history and historical sociology, which frequently do not appear historically accurate or logically sound. Indeed, both history and sociology have suffered because of their isolation, one from the other, and there now seems a tendency for thoughtful scholars in each field to converge to some extent upon common social problems. See Harry E. Barnes and Howard Becker, *Social Thought from Lore to Science,* 2 vols. (New York, 1938), I, 750 ff.

[3] It should be noted in passing that we are dealing here with such "interpretations" of history as any historian commonly employs, as distinct from the more general "philosophy" (Hegelian, Darwinian, etc.), within the framework of which any but the most extremely

It might be well, then, to abandon such guiding threads in favor of the three major determinants as integrating principles in historical synthesis. Or, what amounts to the same thing, we might employ such complex themes as nationalism or colonialism only in so far as we distinguish carefully between the several elements which might be involved in each case. The integration here suggested could be applied equally well to any special phase of history, including "social history" in the narrow sense—which is often criticized as lacking in cohesion—and applies equally well to any given people.

When it is said that biological, cultural, and geographical determinants represent the logical limits within which every general historical interpretation must be elaborated, there is no intention to oversimplify the matter. That these limits are by no means narrow will be obvious enough when it is recalled that a given historical phenomenon may be traced to any one of these factors, or to two or three of them operating simultaneously and in varying degrees.[4]

The story of early Virginia, for instance, may conceivably be stated in terms, first, of the biological nature of the settlers—perhaps their race or their particular class; second, of the ideas, arts, and institutions which were their cultural heritage; and third, of the geography of the tidewater area. Each presumably interacted with the others. If the settlers were inherently a superior people—let us say "Nordics" or "Cavaliers"—this must have enabled them to make more of the English cultural heritage than an inferior race could have done. Yet even the best people were certain to be conditioned in their subsequent history by the physical environment. Nor should we forget that this environment, in

empirical interpretations have to be worked out. See the chapter "Ideas in History," in Allan Nevins, *The Gateway to History* (New York, 1938).

[4] Geographical and biological determinants are of a relatively simple nature, in the sense that both involve relationship between culture and a factor external to it. What is here called the "cultural determinant" is, of course, an enormously complex thing to be described in terms of internal relationships. In dealing with this theme alone the historian must, if he is to be more than a pure empiricist or the unconscious victim of whatever theory is "in the air," work out or accept some theory of these internal relationships. See, for example, the analysis in Pitirim Sorokin, *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, 2 vols. (New York, 1937), I, 13 ff.

turn, was likely to be modified by Englishmen and by English culture. The colonists laid hold of Virginia geography in a manner quite beyond the aborigines. The proudest of the native peoples could never have stripped the top soil from the tidewater region with the effectiveness which marked even the most obscure of the tobacco farmers.

It is the constant action and reaction of all three types of determinants, as just suggested, which make the picture of historical causation so confusing. The primary purpose of most thoughtful historians has naturally been to find some method for simplifying it. The picture must apparently be abandoned as too complicated to have meaning; or else it must be redrawn by the historian's art in such a manner as to feature one phase and to give perspective to the whole. Only in this way may one produce an historical panorama, inviting to the eye and not demanding too much of the imagination.

First of all, the picture may be abandoned by questioning the whole concept of causation. It may be held that close priority of one historical event to another—let us say, the firing on Fort Sumter and Lincoln's first call for volunteers—does not mean that the one "caused" the other. The two phenomena may be mere "concomitant variations" in space-time relationships, and these latter references themselves but categories of the pure reason. Or one may say that while various events have a logical relationship, none can be isolated as "causes" of the others. Such views have the advantage of eliminating the whole baffling problem of what caused what in history and are no doubt intellectually impressive, but they are somewhat disconcerting to anyone who wishes to construct an historical narrative. Without the concept of cause, it is difficult to achieve continuity and without this quality historical writing takes on a mystical or fragmentary nature.

Most historians, therefore, have assumed that one could paint a picture of causation, and that to make this meaningful one had to provide foreground and background—one of the major determinants must be pushed to the front and the others into the dim distance. Lest all this seem a bit figurative, consider illustrations of how this has actually been done by those writing on the history of the South. Indeed, this

may afford a perspective on the history of American history which is not usually emphasized by those who write on the subject.[5]

Our early historians assumed, as a matter of course, that cultural heritage exerted the major influence upon the first settlements. Both Governor William Bradford and Captain John Smith viewed their people as Englishmen who were planting and preserving English culture—or certain phases of that culture—in America. The plain truth is that the majority of settlers did not "go native," even in the first years, as they would have done had the frontier environment overwhelmed them; and it is consequently no wonder that the earliest writers adopted the view just noted. The same attitude is apparent in eighteenth century Southern writers. The historian David Ramsay was so conscious of the unity of American and European culture that, when asked to explain the status of the medical sciences in Charleston in 1800, he did so by reviewing the history of these sciences in Europe during the preceding century.[6]

As one comes further down in Southern historiography, there is encountered the popular ante-bellum view that a cavalier tradition had dominated early Virginia—in contrast to the bourgeois background of New England—and from Virginia had spread out and given tone to Southern life in general. This view expressed the sectional feeling of the time in the prevailing romantic manner, but we are not so concerned here with its origins as with the fact that this again illustrates the prevailing assumption; namely, that the cultural traditions first established in the South played a predominant role in the subsequent development of the section. It is of small moment whether or not we find this attitude in men who called themselves historians; the point is rather that it was common among many who talked or wrote about the South and its past.[7]

[5] It is not emphasized, for example, in Michael Kraus, *History of American History* (New York, 1937). See Charles A. Beard and Alfred Vagts, "Currents of Thought in Historiography," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XLII (1937), 463 ff.; and Carl Becker, "What is Historiography?" *ibid.*, XLIII (1938), 20 ff.

[6] David Ramsay, *A Review of the Improvements, Progress and State of Medicine in the XVIII Century* (Charleston, 1800).

[7] For example, J. H. Van Evrie, M.D., *Negroes and Negro "Slavery"* (New York, 1861), 271, 272.

The same sectional tension which fostered the cavalier tradition also encouraged another fundamental type of interpretation. This was the biological, in the form of an elaborate doctrine of racial controls. Those who are astonished by the racial interpretation now current in Germany would do well to recall its former vogue in this country. It is sometimes forgotten that during the two or three decades prior to the Civil War, a "school" of American writers—chiefly Southern anthropologists and medical men—elaborated the thesis that the white and Negro races were distinct species of separate origin. The Negro was pronounced inherently and therefore permanently inferior; and his history in Africa, in the West Indies, and in the United States was explained upon these grounds. Particularly interesting was the interpretation of developments in Haiti and Jamaica and of the record of the mulatto class in the United States itself. It was claimed, for example, that nine tenths of all the crime committed in this country by "so-called negroes" had really been the work of mulattoes—a fact of considerable interest to social historians if it could be substantiated.[8] This in turn was assumed to prove a racial determinant, although today it would probably be ascribed to social circumstance. The evidence upon which this thesis was based was by no means fanciful, and in the opinion of a present authority was indeed the best available to the biology and anthropology of the day.[9]

It is also of some interest, in passing, to note that American anthropologists who believed in a permanent distinction between races did some work upon the American Indian as well as upon the Negro. This interest can be traced back at least as early as Benjamin Rush's essays of the late eighteenth century. Rush was well known abroad, and from then on there was some give-and-take between European and American anthropologists. One finds that the British authority,

[8] *Ibid.*, 167.

[9] William S. Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South* (Chapel Hill, 1935), 273 ff. It will also be recalled that a more moderate emphasis upon racial factors, not clearly distinguished from the cultural, was implied in the assumptions about Anglo-Saxon Protestant superiority which were expressed by such American historians as John Fiske, John W. Burgess, and John B. McMaster late in the nineteenth century. See Kraus, *History of American History*, 337, 383, 394.

J. C. Pritchard, cited Rush; Pritchard in turn was cited by Samuel B. Morton of Philadelphia; and both Pritchard and Morton were subsequently used by Arthur de Gobineau in his famous essay on racial inequality. Since Morton was closely associated with Josiah Nott, G. R. Gliddon, and other Southern racial theorists, it is possible that this American "school" ultimately influenced Gobineau and therefore contributed something to the basis of contemporary European views on racial determinism.[10]

Meanwhile, the collapse of slavery after the Civil War removed the immediate motive which had encouraged racial interpretations in the United States, although such views doubtless survive more or less unconsciously in the thought of many Americans. The impact of Darwinian doctrine upon biology also discouraged racial determinism. The particular theory of the origin of species, which was first advanced by William C. Wells of Charleston[11] and finally established fifty years later by Charles Darwin, denied that separate origin and permanent distinction between races which was essential to the Southern racial theories. Hence scientific as well as political developments discouraged the survival of such views as a serious mode of thought in this country.

As one approaches the end of the nineteenth century, it is apparent that critical Southern writers were not only abandoning biological theories, but that they were also losing interest in cultural interpretations as well. There were several reasons for this. Although a romantic and nostalgic temper survived long among post-bellum Southern novelists and their readers, it tended to break down earlier among Southern historians trained in Northern seminars. Thus the cavalier tradition was rejected for lack of evidence in able studies which Thomas J. Wertenbaker and others made of the settlement of Virginia. Indeed, it was high time that this tradition should be abandoned even in the interest

[10] J. C. Pritchard, *Physical History of Mankind* (3rd ed., London, 1836), 133; Arthur de Gobineau, *The Inequality of Human Races,* trans. by A. Collins (New York, 1915), 185 n. My attention was called to this element in Gobineau by my colleague, Dr. Richard H. Heindel.

[11] Richard H. Shryock, "William Charles Wells," in *Dictionary of American Biography,* 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), XIX, 644-45. Wells was especially, perhaps exclusively, concerned with the origin of what he considered human species.

of pro-Southern feeling, since it had long since been turned against the section by Northern critics. If Southerners could view New Englanders as bourgeois or even plebeian in origin, the latter could and did view Southern beginnings in terms of convicts and servants, or at best as the work of so-called gentlemen of a most indifferent sort.

Polemics of this nature were as superficial in one section as in the other; but there was a special reason for the Southern desire to abandon them in our own day. It became increasingly apparent that economic and cultural difficulties in the South, while caused in part by the Civil War, had actually set in before that struggle and might indeed be viewed as a cause as well as an effect of the same.[12] Southern historians naturally found it difficult to explain such things in terms of cavalier ancestors, nor would their critical standards permit ascribing everything to the machinations of Yankee exploiters. There was all too much truth in this last thesis—witness its recent revival by Walter P. Webb and others—but clearly not the whole truth. There must be some other explanation of this old story.

It was quite natural, under the circumstances, to turn to the third major determinant for possible enlightenment. It is questionable whether geographical factors in American history had ever been properly recognized prior to about 1890, although they were doubtless noted at times in relatively obscure writings. Thus a member of the racial school, John Campbell of Philadelphia, argued in 1850 that geographical circumstances were even changing the biological make-up of Europeans in America[13]—a view revived with more exact data by Franz Boas in our own time.

The present emphasis upon geographical determinism in history was encouraged by the studies of human geography made by Henry T. Buckle and others, and applied to American history by Nathaniel S. Shaler, Ellen Semple, and their contemporaries.[14] Somewhat indepen-

[12] See the well-known analysis in Robert R. Russel, *Economic Aspects of Southern Sectionalism, 1840-1861,* University of Illinois *Studies in the Social Sciences,* XI, No. I, Pts. I, II (Urbana, 1923).

[13] John Campbell, *Negro-Mania* (Philadelphia, 1851), 216 ff.

[14] See Arthur M. Schlesinger, *New Viewpoints in American History* (New York, 1922), 45.

dently Frederick J. Turner, conscious of the neglect of geographical factors by American historians, wove them along with certain other strands into his frontier thesis.[15] It is no disparagement of Turner or his followers to suggest that they may naturally have welcomed this theory as one lending significance to their own section, the Middle West, just as New England historians had long been impressed by interpretations complimentary to their portion of the country.

Southern historians found the new geographical emphasis quite acceptable, although for somewhat different reasons than those which may have influenced their Western colleagues. If the basic economic difficulties of the Old South had been forced upon it by stern geographical necessity, there was no reason for blaming these troubles upon either the original settlers or their descendants. The classic expression of this recent geographical interpretation of Southern history is probably the eloquent opening paragraph of Ulrich B. Phillips' *Life and Labor in the Old South,* which begins with the weather and then by brief, necessarily connected steps, carries us inevitably into so complex and remote a consequence as the American Civil War.

It is doubtful if any thoughtful historian would question today that Turner, Phillips, and other Western and Southern historians have performed a most valuable service to our historiography in recognizing the importance of geographical factors. The revision of earlier interpretations resulting therefrom has been enlightening and suggestive, and will undoubtedly remain a permanent element in subsequent investigations. Yet it is quite in order to pose the question: Have those who emphasize geographical determinism—like those who earlier supported other "schools"—already carried their thesis to a point where it needs modification in the interest of the other major determinants? This query was raised here and there more than a decade ago with reference to Turner and the Western historians, and has recently swelled into a considerable chorus.[16]

[15] Fulmer Mood, "Turner's Formative Period," in *Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner* (Madison, Wis., 1938), 33 ff.

[16] See, especially, the suggestive essays (pro and con) by Avery O. Craven, John D. Hicks, and B. F. Wright, Jr., in Dixon R. Fox (ed.), *Sources of Culture in the Middle West* (New York, 1935).

In a paper read last year, the writer attempted to present the same question with regard rather to Southern historians, and to note the evidence which would seem to call for a return to cultural approaches in studying the history of the South.[17] This did not imply any desire to claim all things for the cultural heritage. In fact, an effort was made to find a way out of the recurring swing from one extreme of interpretation to another—that pendulum phenomenon which in history or any other field is apt to indicate a low level of scientific procedure.

The way out suggested was that we should try to determine the relative influence of one of the major determinants as compared with another, by seeking some historical situation in which the one factor seemed a constant and the other a variable. In this way, we might approach (even though we could not fully realize) those conditions of laboratory experiment which have proved so fruitful in the natural sciences. The particular illustration suggested in this connection was the contrast afforded by the agricultural and social history of British and German farmers who settled in similar regions of Pennsylvania and the Old South—in a word, an historical setting in which cultural heritage was a variable but the geographical environment a more or less constant factor.

A tentative study of this subject seemed to indicate that the cultural factors played a greater role in Southern agricultural origins than has recently been accorded them. Cumulative data indicated that the Germans, during the eighteenth century, almost universally held a reputation for superior farming; and that this superiority was due in large measure to such cultural equipment as the ability to select better lands, superior techniques, and a considerable aversion to slavery. Conversely, the cultural background of the English settlers of Virginia made for a less happy selection of land, inferior technique, and a dependence upon

[17] A paper read before a joint session of the American Historical Association and the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, in Philadelphia, December 30, 1937. An unauthorized and partial version was subsequently published in the *American-German Review* (Philadelphia, 1935-), IV (1938), 36 ff., presumably for other purposes than my own, but the complete paper appeared in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1915-), XXVI (1939), 39-54.

slave labor. The resulting contrast between the intensive, diversified, free-labor farming of the German-Americans and the extensive, money-crop, slave-labor system of the Anglo-Americans, was apparent in similar areas and even in such identical regions as central Maryland and North Carolina.[18]

There is no occasion to repeat here the evidence considered in an earlier study, but one further question might well be raised; namely, how long was the cultural contrast noted maintained in a common environment? It is conceivable that such differences might have proved very temporary, until environmental forces "ironed them out" into a common American way of life. Had this actually occurred, that is, had the Germans lost their folkways and traditions within a generation, the process would not necessarily have been due to any geographical influences. It might be viewed simply as a process of cultural exchange, during which the Germans contributed a few things to the English-speaking majority—say a taste for pretzels and for good music—while they took over most of the prevailing heritage. In a word, Americanization may at first have been little more than a process of Anglicization carried on in America.

Whatever one thinks of such reasoning, the plain truth is that the Americanization of the early Germans—the so-called Pennsylvania Dutch—was an extremely slow affair. In consequence, their particular cultural heritage remained for a long period, and to some extent still remains, a significant influence in the areas in which they originally settled. More than a century after they first cleared their lands in Pennsylvania, Virginia, and North Carolina, one finds just the same comments on their agriculture as were noted during the Colonial period. Thus Harriet Martineau, a keen and critical observer, wrote of them about 1835:

> There is one certain test of the permanent fitness of any district of country for agricultural purposes; the settlement of any large numbers of Germans in it. They are much smiled at by the vivacious and enterprising Americans for their plodding, their attachment to their own methods, and the odd direction taken

[18] *Ibid.*

by their pride. . . . Nothing can be more thriving than the settlements of Germans.[19]

Here one has the old report of agricultural superiority, plus a comment on the persistence of culture patterns despite the disdain of the English-speaking majority. The latter were still engaged in "getting rich quick" at the expense of posterity; while the German-Americans continued to get rich slowly to the benefit of those who came after them.

It should be added here, for the sake of clarity, that neither of the peoples under consideration were exempt from geographical influences. The land-labor ratio, just the reverse in America of that in the old countries, always tempted settlers to adopt extensive, inferior farming procedures. These apparently paid better at the time. Miss Martineau made some interesting observations in this connection also. She noted that in her day English immigrants at first attempted an intensive cultivation of American farms. (She was speaking of actual farmers, who had presumably benefited by the agricultural revolution in the mother country.) But, she added, the Englishman after a few seasons "learns that he has got to a place where it answers to spend land to save labour; the reverse of his experience in England; and he soon becomes as slovenly a farmer as the American and begins immediately to grow rich."[20] In a word, while the "plodding" Germans resisted this geographical temptation almost indefinitely, English settlers of the nineteenth century—like their compatriots of an earlier age—could withstand it for but "a few seasons."

The significance of this contrast for the long-range history of the South is obvious enough. If the subject has been correctly presented, the difficulties of the section were not entirely determined by soil and climate but turned in part on the type of people who exploited these resources. The Anglo-Americans proved to be the sort who could use them best to immediate advantage, the German-Americans a type who

[19] Harriet Martineau, *Society in America,* 2 vols. (New York, 1837), I, 297, 298; see, also, 340. My attention was called to these references by my former student, Miss Nannie Tilley of the Duke University Library.

[20] *Ibid.,* 338.

could improve them for posterity. The dominance of the former group and their customs was at least one major factor in bringing on agricultural difficulties, continued colonial dependence, colonial protests, and, finally, a second war for independence—in about that chronological order. Here again is what Professor Phillips would have termed a "house that Jack built," but one with a different foundation from that which he described.

This perspective on Southern developments has implications for world history as well as for our own. As far as it goes, it presents the British settlers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as people poorly adapted for the colonization of agricultural regions. The general success of their empire has perhaps blinded us to this fact—a success apparently due to maritime and manufacturing skills. The English, like any other people, naturally did best in regions to which their particular gifts were well adapted. In New England, for example, their seafaring ability saved the day. This very maritime success, however, finally gave them control of the world's seaways and colonies, and may have indirectly discouraged Continental peoples from settling great open areas like Canada, Australia, and our own South. It seems probable that Continental peasants were better adapted to such regions than were the English unemployed. But German and Italian governments had no colonies to which to send their farmers, while the Dutch and French lost their holdings after English victories. All this suggests that the pride which both Englishmen and Americans have taken in Anglo-Saxon colonization, as well as the disdain they have sometimes felt for Spanish and German attempts in the same direction, is due for a thorough overhauling.[21]

So much, then, for an illustration of cultural variables studied against the background of a common environment. Historians, for various rea-

[21] Recall, for example, the expressions of such pride in Theodore Roosevelt, *Winning of the West,* 6 vols. (New York, 1900). The labors of our Latin-American historians have already made for greater appreciation of Spanish accomplishments; while Georg Friederici's recent work, *Der Charakter Der Entdeckung und Eroberung Amerikas Durch Die Europäer,* 3 vols. (Stuttgart, 1936), presents the English story against the background of the other Europeans in a manner suggesting critical comparisons. See, for example, *ibid.,* III, 194 ff.

sons, have not usually employed the procedure here involved. The study of such special cultural groups as the German-Americans has usually been motivated by an interest in these people for their own sake, with the ultimate purpose of explaining their "contributions" to American life. This is plainly legitimate and important; but it has not ordinarily involved such use of their history as is suggested above. This latter procedure calls for a critical contrast of different groups, not to prove one or the other superior but simply to discover whether there were divergences between them which cannot be ascribed to the common environment. It is obvious that the contrast between British and German settlers is not the only one which could be employed. It is possible, for example, that a significant comparison could be found in early Virginia between two groups of the English-speaking majority themselves; namely, between the Quakers who settled special areas and the larger number who possessed an Anglican background.

There remains, finally, one other question which was latent in the discussion of cultural factors. Reference was there made to "the sort of people" who colonized the South. It was tacitly assumed that this phrase had only cultural implications and did not relate to their physical make-up. No recourse to biological theories seemed necessary, in view of the fact that certain cultural limitations of the English settlers—their lack of farming experience, their profit motive, and so on—seemed adequate to explain their later difficulties. But since able authorities have never entirely abandoned the biological perspective, it would be wise to consider at least the possibility of checking this as well as the other major influences.[22]

It would be most interesting if we could discover any actual historical situation in which geographical and cultural elements were constants, and only racial or class phenomena were variables. This might afford us a sort of laboratory test for the physical factor, just as the study

[22] American historians and sociologists have long been skeptical about biological factors, but not so American biologists. See, for example, Edwin G. Conklin, "Some Biological Aspects of Immigration," in *Scribner's Magazine* (New York, 1887-), LXIX (1921), 352 ff. "There was once," observes Dr. Conklin, "the supreme chance of breeding here the finest race and nation in the whole history of mankind. . . . That chance is gone forever." *Ibid.*, 358.

summarized above was intended as a check on cultural determinants. Imagine a situation in which the same geographical area (tidewater Virginia) was settled by people possessing the same culture (English) and social opportunities, but sharply divided among themselves along racial lines. Unfortunately, one does have to "imagine" this, for the past has been niggardly in supplying actual settings of this nature. The Virginia Negro of 1800 lived in the same region as the whites, but his culture was an imperfect copy of theirs—perhaps because social opportunity was so largely lacking.

A closer approach to laboratory conditions might be found in the recent record, let us say, of the civilized tribes in Oklahoma, who live in the same or similar areas as the whites, possess more or less of the same culture, and have some degree of social opportunity. Perhaps even better conditions for such an investigation could be found in Mexico or Brazil, but these are beyond our present province. One suspects that such tests would prove negative, but we are hardly in a position to be dogmatic about this. The point is that a historical check on the biological factor, while very difficult, is not necessarily impossible.

Since opportunities of this sort do exist, one may summarize by saying that a renewed study of cultural and possibly of biological origins in the South is indicated for two reasons; first, because it affords a possible opportunity to vary our general procedures; second, for the reason that it may also modify our interpretations and conclusions. We have quite properly heard much of the influence of sections upon American history. We may now also consider, as a phase of that whole process, the influence of sections upon American historians.

The American Society of Equity in Kentucky: A Recent Attempt in Agrarian Reform[1]

By THEODORE SALOUTOS

One of the most dramatic episodes in recent agrarian history has had the tobacco fields of Kentucky and western Tennessee for its stage. Commencing early in the twentieth century, a number of sporadic attempts made by the farmers of this area to organize and resist the encroachments of monopoly culminated in what was then popularly referred to as the "Great Tobacco Strike," the "Tobacco Wars," and "Night Riding." Of great significance were the social, economic, and psychological factors attending this melodramatic outburst of agrarian wrath.

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, the tobacco industry was stimulated by two important events: first, the discovery of the white Burley leaf, and second, the rise of the capitalist system. White Burley, introduced in 1864, met with instant public favor; and capitalism, with its industrial and financial accompaniments, readily adapted itself to the tobacco market.[2] Under favorable conditions tobacco consumption enjoyed tremendous increases, to the profit of both producer and manufacturer.

As tobacco rose in popularity, the corporation rapidly assumed control of the market. The American Tobacco Company, formed in 1890

[1] See J. A. Everitt, *The Third Power* (Indianapolis, 1903), for an account of the purposes of the American Society of Equity. Its ultimate objective was to obtain profitable prices for all products of the farm. It was organized in Indianapolis on December 24, 1902.

[2] E. H. Mathewson, "The Export and Manufacturing Tobaccos of the United States, with Brief Reference to Cigar Types," in United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Plant Industry, *Bulletin No. 244* (Washington, 1912), 71.

with an initial investment of $25,000,000, underwent a period of rapid expansion and consolidation till in 1906 it was capitalized in excess of $235,000,000. In 1906 the Commissioner of Corporations announced that eighty-six corporations throughout the United States, its dependencies, Cuba, and the foreign countries in which the British-American operated, came under the influence of the combination. In short, the combination was master of the tobacco markets of the world.[3]

Not only did the American Tobacco Company control the markets; it soon subjected the tobacco farmer to precarious conditions. The cultivation of tobacco is generally concentrated within a relatively small area, within which soil and climate create districts that specialize in one type of tobacco. Central Kentucky devoted itself primarily to the cultivation of white Burley; west of it was the Green River country specializing in a heavy dark export brand; west and south of the Green River district lay the Henderson Stemming region, likewise specializing in a dark export type; and to the west of the Henderson area was the "black-patch" or "dark-fired" country, embracing counties in both Kentucky and Tennessee.[4] It is estimated that at the start of the twentieth century, some 85 of the 119 counties of Kentucky were dependent on tobacco.[5]

For some twenty or thirty years prior to the tobacco difficulties, an army of "ignorant, illiterate, tenant-farmers" had poured into the tobacco areas to raise tobacco on share leases.[6] The tenant would usually be assigned thirty or forty acres and a house, barn, and sheds. The houses were merely shacks that constantly needed repairs. Upon receiving his land allotment, the tenant proceeded to raise tobacco on about ten acres; and devoted the remainder to corn, vegetables, pasture,

[3] *Report of the Commissioner of Corporations on the Tobacco Industry,* 3 pts. (Washington, 1909-1915), I, *Position of the Tobacco Combination in the Industry* (1909), 14-15. The British-American conducted the combination's foreign business.

[4] John L. Mathews, "Agrarian Pooling in Kentucky," in *Charities and the Commons* (New York, 1897-), XX (1908), 193; J. C. Miller, *The Black Patch War* (Chapel Hill, 1936), 1.

[5] *Wisconsin Equity News* (Madison, 1908-1933), I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 1; E. A. Jonas, "The Night-Riders: A Trust of Farmers," in *World's Work* (New York, 1900-), XVII (1909), 11214.

[6] Mathews, "Agrarian Pooling in Kentucky," in *loc. cit.,* 193.

or possibly wheat. The landlord, likewise, advanced the necessary money to cultivate the crop and maintain the tenant's family. At the end of the year, the tenant shared the crop with the landlord; the former selling the remaining half and paying the latter his obligations, and then supposedly pocketing the profits that seldom accrued. To improve his economic status, the tenant sought to increase his acreage and frequently added a new member to the family in hopes of receiving an additional wageless worker. Investigations, nevertheless, reveal that a lifetime of such conditions frequently left the tenant farmer worse off than when he began.[7]

While the producer sought to accelerate his productive powers along what appeared to be a rising market, the combination had already commenced its program for purchase control. The manufacturing and marketing processes of the industry were already under control; next, tobacco prices paid the producer were to come under the trust's dictatorial rule. Middlemen and independent buyers who previously purchased their tobacco directly from the producer and resold it to the combination, were eliminated or cut to a minimum. Usually one and occasionally two agents, who in no sense competed with each other, traveled the tobacco country to purchase for the company.[8] Thus commenced a policy of reorganization that took its toll in hardship and violence, to the detriment of the producer, the manufacturer, and the tobacco country in general.

The planter being a close marginal producer soon felt the bitter effects of the combination's new policy. The first signs of depression were low tobacco prices in a period of generally high living costs. In the early 1900's wholesale prices of Hopkinsville leaf, a dark type, sold as low as four and six cents; as did Clarksville leaf, another dark variety.[9] In the Burley districts "poverty and distress" prevailed and

[7] *Ibid.;* Miller, *Black Patch War,* 2.

[8] *Senate Documents,* 59 Cong., 2 Sess., VI, No. 372, p. 42; Anna Youngman, "The Tobacco Pools of Kentucky and Tennessee," in *Journal of Political Economy* (Chicago, 1892-), XVIII (1910), 36; Miller, *Black Patch War,* 14-15; T. D. Clark, *History of Kentucky* (New York, 1937), 554-55; C. M. Meachem, *A History of Christian County, Kentucky* (Nashville, 1930), 343.

[9] *Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture, 1913* (Washington, 1914), 431.

conditions became so deplorable that "many producers were compelled to sell tobacco at prices which returned them thirty cents a day."[10]

Not only did tobacco prices decline but tobacco raising itself was threatened for the want of certain conditions favorable to its well-being. Many capable planters cultivating tobacco at a cost of six cents per pound and forced to sell at the ruinous level of three and four, left the tobacco country and migrated to more profitable farming regions. Labor costs were high. A good farm hand demanded $1.50 in the dark-patch regions and $2.00 to $3.00 per day in the Burley areas, but low tobacco prices made the payment of a decent wage impossible.[11] As a result, the more able farm hands left the tobacco fields to seek employment in mining, railroading, or in urban communities.[12]

Despite the deeply implanted isolationist attitude of the farmers, the possibilities of combined action were beginning to be sensed by many. As early as 1901 agitation to restrict acreage and the possible benefits of tobacco pooling became frequent topics of discussion.[13] Numerous local associations were formed but their existence was short-lived.[14] An attempt to pool the 1904 crop was made but failed because of the want of adequate financial resources to tide the farmers through the waiting period.[15] In 1905 a pool, which was started among the Burley producers

[10] H. C. Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture* (New York, 1929), 246-47.

[11] *Wisconsin Equity News,* I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 2; Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture,* 246.

[12] *Wisconsin Equity News,* I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 2.

[13] E. H. Mathewson, "Tobacco Marketing in the United States," in United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Plant Industry, *Bulletin No. 268* (Washington, 1913), 47.

[14] *Wisconsin Equity News,* I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 4; Mathewson, "The Export and Manufacturing Tobaccos of the United States," in *loc. cit.,* 79; Jonas, "The Night-Riders: A Trust of Farmers," in *loc. cit.,* 11214. While the producer was speedily heading in the direction of financial adversity, the combination was experiencing the most profitable years of its existence. The prices of its principal brands to the consumer remained relatively constant, whereas the prices extracted from its jobbers were increased to add to its enormous profits. The combination's most fruitful years, 1903-1908, were the most trying for the producer. Thus, while the trust enjoyed lower tax rates, moderate leaf costs, decreased advertising expenditures, and perfect monopolistic control, the producer scarcely earned a decent livelihood. *Report of the Commissioner of Corporations on the Tobacco Industry,* III, *Prices, Costs, and Profits* (1915), 7-8.

[15] Mathewson, "The Export and Manufacturing Tobaccos of the United States," in *loc. cit.,* 79.

of central Kentucky, encountered little success.[16] The American Society of Equity, in the meantime, had commenced to penetrate the tobacco areas of Kentucky and Tennessee and once again some of the most influential planters talked of the possibilities of co-operative action.[17] With the price drop of 1904, renewed emphasis was given to co-operative sentiment and crop restriction and tobacco-pooling propaganda increased in momentum.[18]

The American Society of Equity, the first agricultural organization to make its appearance in the twentieth century in the upper Mississippi Valley, was founded in Indianapolis on December 24, 1902. Operating on the theory that agricultural producers were not receiving an equitable price for their products, the Equity founders conceived the idea of organizing the farmers to place a price on all products of the "farm and orchard." The leaders predicted that the farmers if properly organized could wield a power comparable to that of organized capital and labor.

In the face of these ruinous conditions, Felix G. Ewing, a wealthy planter of Glenraven, Tennessee, called some sixty or seventy of the more influential planters to his home for a conference early in the spring of 1904.[19] Ewing, being a man of influence and leisure, presented an elaborate analysis of the planters' difficulties, and convinced them their only hope was organization. The farmers accepted the suggestion and immediately became "apostles of the new idea."[20] On September 24, 1904, a meeting was called to convene at Guthrie, Todd County, on the Kentucky-Tennessee line, where some six thousand farmers assem-

[16] J. S. Porter, "Kentucky Tobacco Pools," in *Kentucky Progress Magazine* (Frankfort, 1928-), IV (1932), No. 5, p. 25.

[17] *Up-to-Date Farming* (Indianapolis, 1898-1917), VI (1903), No. 19, pp. 17-18. Membership in Equity at the time virtually consisted of a year's subscription to the official organ of the Society. In 1903 Equity boasted a membership of 2,156 in Kentucky and 1,808 in Tennessee.

[18] Mathewson, "Tobacco Marketing in the United States," in *loc. cit.*, 47.

[19] Youngman, "The Tobacco Pools of Kentucky and Tennessee," in *loc. cit.*, 47; Marie Taylor, "Night Riders in the Black Patch" (Master's Thesis, University of Kentucky Library, Lexington, 1934), 11-18. The Planters' Protective Association, which functioned from 1904 to 1913, operated in eighteen counties of Kentucky and ten in Tennessee, mainly along the Kentucky border.

[20] *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 6.

bled. Congressman John W. Gaines of Tennessee and Augustus O. Stanley of Kentucky addressed the gathering. Before the day ended the Planters' Protective Association had been organized.[21]

While the dark tobacco growers were busy organizing their respective groups, the Burley planters, this time largely under the direct supervision of Equity, commenced a campaign of organization.[22] The American Society of Equity hoped to obtain equitable prices by controlling the production and distribution of crops. In theory the Equity program consisted of two parts: first, organizing the farmers to place a price on their product; and second, eliminating a portion of the crop if necessary to influence prices.[23]

Among the early converts to the needs of co-operative action was a youthful Henry County farmer, H. E. McSwain, who, persuaded by the merits of the "Equity idea," traversed the Burley areas with a mortgage in one hand and arguments in the other to stir the planters into action. The results were that eight local Equity unions were established and the prospects for more were encouraging.[24] Delegates from these eight locals met at Newcastle on October 1, 1906. The gathering, however, accomplished nothing because of the presence of trust emissaries and the pleas of the numerous delegates to adjourn and call another meeting. The assembly adjourned to reconvene at Winchester on October 10. The planters, more sensitive to existing conditions and problems, succeeded in carrying their fight to the floor of the State Development Association, an organization of business men, where they gained sympathy and recruits for their cause. Inspired by this and other encourag-

[21] O. B. Jesness, "The Cooperative Marketing of Tobacco," in Kentucky Agricultural Station, *Bulletin No. 288* (Lexington, 1928), 276; Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture,* 247. Professor Jesness takes the view that Equity and the Protective Association were not very intimately associated. Filley, on the other hand, states that Equity was largely responsible for the organization of the Planters' Protective Association. However, it appears that Equity, with the membership it had, must have exerted some influence.

[22] Jesness, "The Cooperative Marketing of Tobacco," in *loc. cit.,* 276.

[23] J. L. Nash, "Building a Farmers' Monopoly," in *World Today* (New York, 1901-), XIII (1907), 720. As one Equity enthusiast stated: "It is not the big crops that made money for the farmers. The largest crops we have raised have brought the smallest returns, while our short crops have been money makers."

[24] *Wisconsin Equity News,* I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 4.

ing developments, the planters decided to embark on a still greater campaign of education.[25]

Equity, in the meantime, increased its activities by sending more organizers and sheaves of co-operative literature to the scene of operations. Dr. George W. McMillan of Pendleton County was named manager of a "forty-day whirlwind campaign" to pledge farmers not to dispose of their 1905 crop at the prices offered by the trust. "Two-score speaking and proselyting parties were at once organized, eloquent speakers were found, brass bands were hired, calls and notices were printed, and they started out to meet on January 2, 1907."[26]

On January 2, 58 per cent of the estimated 92,000 acres planted for the year were reported pledged to the new organization.[27] Under the leadership of J. Campbell Cantrill, president of the Kentucky Union of Equity and later congressman from his district,[28] the Burley Tobacco Society was organized with Clarence LeBus, a wealthy Cynthiana planter, as president, and Lucian Beckner, a young Winchester lawyer, as secretary.[29]

While organizers campaigned the tobacco country for membership and their representatives sought to mediate their difficulties, the Society of Equity took to political action. Kentucky's constitution made it mandatory upon the legislature to enact legislation declaring illegal the combining or pooling of articles for the purpose of enhancing prices. The legislature, influenced by the size of its agricultural population and the seriousness of the crisis, enacted a measure declaring that persons

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] Everitt, *The Third Power* (4th ed.), 289. In the ceremonies that followed the meeting, Everitt, national president of the American Society of Equity, was heralded "as the Moses who had pointed out the way," and Sherman, national organizer, "as the Aaron who had held up his hand and led on to the promised land."

[28] *Who's Who in America, 1910-1911* (Chicago, 1910), 306; J. Campbell Cantrill had a varied political career before assuming the presidency of the Kentucky union. He was chairman of the Scott County, Kentucky, Democratic Committee, 1895-1897; a member of the state Senate, 1901-1904; was nominated, but declined the nomination, for Congress in 1904; was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1904; and in 1908 was elected to Congress.

[29] *Wisconsin Equity News,* I (1908-1909), No. 2, p. 6. Clarence LeBus, president of the Burley Society, was a dealer and grower of tobacco.

engaged in agriculture might combine or pool for the purpose of securing better prices. The law further provided that it was an offense for any third person to persuade a member to withdraw from the pool or to dispose of his tobacco otherwise than through the channels prescribed by the organization.[30]

The enthusiasm of the members increased tremendously and prospects appeared very promising. Members agreed to deliver their unsold 1906 and their entire 1907 crop to be warehoused until the price rose to fifteen cents. Sixty-five thousand acres were pledged to the 1906 pool and in 1907, 108,000 of the 160,000 planted were promised. The Burley farmers became so determined, rumors were soon circulated in the tobacco country that unless their demands were met, the entire 1908 crop would be eliminated.[31]

Despite the methods employed to facilitate organization, difficulties of the most trying character arose. The unfavorable land tenure system, the slow, lethargic, and indifferent farmer, financial inability, and trust opposition delayed action. The land tenure system was obviously very discouraging.[32] As one third to one half of the farms were operated by financially pressed tenants, the farmers were anxious to negotiate immediate sales. Financial assistance was indispensable. Fortunately, however, both the Planters' Protective Association and the Burley Society received considerable assistance from their wealthier members. Sympathetic warehousemen in Louisville and Cincinnati who saw their business menaced rendered an assisting hand.[33]

[30] E. G. Nourse, *The Legal Status of Agricultural Cooperation* (New York, 1927), 541-43. The act of 1906 contained the following emergency provision: "Whereas, many persons of the Commonwealth now desire to combine their respective crops of tobacco, wheat, corn and other farm products an emergency is now declared."

A novel piece of legislation, if passed, would have forbidden a combination or trust from transacting business in the state, and would have required of every purchaser a certification that he was not purchasing for any "trust" or "combination." *Wisconsin Equity News,* I (1908-1909), No. 3, pp. 5-6.

[31] *Wisconsin Equity News,* I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 5.

[32] Youngman, "The Tobacco Pools of Kentucky and Tennessee," in *loc. cit.,* 40-41; John L. Mathews, "The Farmer's Union and the Tobacco Pool," in *Atlantic Monthly* (Boston, 1857-), CII (1908), 484.

[33] *Wisconsin Equity News,* I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 5; R. Bache, "The Great Tobacco Strike," in *Technical World Magazine* (Chicago, 1904-1923), VI (1907), 604; Youngman, "The Tobacco Pools of Kentucky and Tennessee," in *loc. cit.,* 43. The farmer upon

Another obstacle was the stern opposition of the combination. As expected, the trust stopped at nothing to break the pooling movement. The press was utilized in every conceivable form. Words of "friendly warning" were made to the neighboring banks and many, frightened at the trust's power, insisted on payment when the farmers' paper matured.[34] On one occasion, a "fake" co-operative, launched by the trust, succeeded in attracting a number of farmers who learned too late that it was a company device to smash the farmers' program.[35]

One of the most powerful weapons employed by the combination was the old Standard Oil method of overbidding the competitor. Trust agents traveled from farm to farm seeking to convince the farmers of the benefits of selling direct to the company. One such purchaser remarked: "What is the use of going into the association? We will give you as good and better prices than they can get for you and there will be no commissions or expenses. Sell to us direct, here is the cash for you now!" Many of the planters, attracted by the lucrative offer, succumbed and sold out, with little thought as to the effect their action would have.[36]

One of the most discouraging obstacles was the independent farmer who asserted his independence by refusing to join the association. Some were convinced the organization could not possibly increase the value of their crop. Others believed a better price could be obtained by refusing to join the association, and many actually succeeded in getting it; consequently, the talk of co-operative action to these people was futile. Many refused membership because of the failure of previous attempts, while still others suspected organizers of utilizing a perfectly good ideal to enhance their personal ambitions.

Association members viewed the independent farmer with alarm, for while the member pledged not to sell, the nonmember or "hillbilly" cashed in at a remunerative figure. This not only provoked the pool

delivering his tobacco to the warehouse would receive a certificate that could be discounted at the bank.

[34] *Wisconsin Equity News,* I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 6.

[35] *Organized Farmer* (Wausau, Milwaukee, 1915-1922), III (1917), No. 13, p. 4. This "fake" co-operative charged $1.00 for membership while Equity charged $4.00.

[36] *Wisconsin Equity News,* I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 6.

members but, in turn, caused many to withhold further membership. The disgusted member could see no possible advantage in joining the organization and suffering, while the independent farmer remained outside the fold and enjoyed all the possible benefits an organization could bring—a higher price.

At the outset association membership was voluntary, but it soon became apparent that a more aggressive policy would have to be employed. The use of violence was not without precedent in Kentucky. Its prototype appeared in the Reconstruction period following the Civil War. A few years prior to the tobacco difficulties the "toll-gate" system in Kentucky appeared oppressive and much agitation to eliminate the practice was waged. Convinced of the improbabilities of legislative relief, a group of Kentuckians undertook a campaign of night riding that eventually culminated in the system's complete elimination.[37]

Aware of the accomplishments of these early uprisings and convinced of the futility of the tobacco farmers' peaceful attempts at co-operation, the suggestion of violent action commenced to take hold in the minds of some of the more prominent pool leaders. "There existed, therefore, a deep-seated sense of grievance and injury," commented the *World's Work*. "The farmers led to regard themselves as the victims of organized and legalized plunder grew reckless in speech and bitter in spirit. Protests were futile, the courts no longer offered hope of redress. Organized opposition was the last resource."[38] Consequently, more radical measures were in the process of formation. "His neighbors proceeded to organize secret bands, first to threaten him, next to destroy his property, finally to whip him, and if need were, to kill him."[39] Night riding became a stark reality.

A variety of methods were employed by the masked riders to enforce their demands. The whip was inflicted on the nonconforming farmer or on those who "talked too much"; tobacco purchasers as well as farmers were brutally assaulted; arson and shootings were by no means

[37] *Ibid.;* Mathews, "The Farmer's Union and the Tobacco Pool," in *loc. cit.,* 489-90; Thomas C. Cherry, *Kentucky* (Boston, 1923), 312.

[38] Jonas, "The Night-Riders: A Trust of Farmers," in *loc. cit.,* 11214.

[39] Youngman, "The Tobacco Pools of Kentucky and Tennessee," in *loc. cit.,* 45.

uncommon; plant beds were sown with salt or grass seed; and threshing machines were dynamited. One terror-stricken farmer found that during the night a grave had been dug in the midst of one of his plant beds. A tobacco factory was destroyed at Trenton. In December, 1906, an armed force of masked riders invaded Princeton and destroyed a number of barns containing approximately two hundred thousand pounds of tobacco. In January, 1907, the Cadiz railroad was warned not to haul tobacco to Hopkinsville.[40] In March, a band of night riders rolled twenty-one hogsheads of tobacco into the Cumberland River.[41] In December, Hopkinsville was besieged by a band of riders coming from four directions, who seized all means of communication, the police and fire departments, the administrative quarters of the city government, and destroyed one large warehouse and a tobacco factory.[42]

These developments were, of course, to have their repercussions on the social, political, and economic life of the tobacco country. Selling tobacco independent of the farmers' associations was dangerous; neighbors became suspicious of one another; and terror prevailed everywhere. The courts of law were paralyzed because of perjury, packed juries, or fear on the part of witnesses to testify against the known "marauders."[43] Hundreds of farmers left the tobacco areas in search of homes elsewhere. In 1907 the Secretary of the Kentucky Board of Fire Underwriters cautioned that "unless confidence can be restored, the companies will refuse indemnity to all handlers of tobacco."[44]

Changes, however, were soon to come. In 1907 the traditionally Democratic state of Kentucky elected a Republican administration headed by Governor Augustus E. Willson, who was accused of being unduly sympathetic with the tobacco trust.[45] One of his first acts was to appeal to the state "to take strong, prompt and effective measures to

[40] Meachem, *History of Christian County, Kentucky,* 346-48; Miller, *Black Patch War,* 16-17.

[41] In such instances as these the night riders were apt to cite the activities of the Boston Tea Party as a "justifying precedent." See Miller, *Black Patch War,* 18.

[42] Jonas, "The Night-Riders: A Trust of Farmers," in *loc. cit.,* 11215.

[43] *Ibid.,* 11217.

[44] Taylor, "Night Riders in the Black Patch," 38.

[45] Lexington *Herald,* November 2, 1908.

punish every cowardly scoundrel who rides the road to threaten his neighbors."[46] State troops were rushed to the scenes of lawlessness where, after being "ambushed" or "misdirected" and subjected to local prejudices that resented interference by the state government, they began slowly to enforce the law.[47]

In the course of t ese violent outbursts, public sentiment, which previously stood firmly behind the farmers, assumed a decidedly hostile attitude. The press denounced Equity members as rioters and outlaws and condemned others for their association affiliations. The Louisville *Courier-Journal* declared the farmers had a just cause in fighting the trust but protested that outlawry was no solution to the difficulties. "Masquerading is cowardice. Cowardice is cruelty. Through these agencies not only is Kentucky brought to blush, but farmers are put in for consequences which in the long run prove ruinous."[48] In defending the Society, the Benton, Kentucky, *Tribune-Democrat* stated: "Possibly some of the night-riders are members of the American Society of Equity and the Dark Tobacco Association, just as different churches have bad people [who] become members of the church, but that does not make the churches bad; neither does the night-rider make the association bad."[49] Equity leaders disclaimed responsibility for violence and openly denounced the practice; nevertheless, it was apparent that some of the Equity members were active in the affairs of the masked order.

With night riding falling into disrepute and negotiations failing to materialize in a satisfactory agreement, pool leaders became more desperate and discussed the possibilities of making another determined effort to control production. Having the 1906 crop unsold, the 1907 crop coming in, and the trust refusing to accept the tobacco pool's demands, Equity and Burley leaders proposed to eliminate the entire crop for 1908. Soon thereafter the Peaceful Riders by Day, an organization commanded by some of the most influential planters of the tobacco country,

[46] Cherry, *Kentucky,* 312; Meachem, *History of Christian County, Kentucky,* 357; Jonas, "The Night-Riders: A Trust of Farmers," in *loc. cit.,* 11217.

[47] Jonas, "The Night-Riders: A Trust of Farmers," in *loc. cit.,* 11217.

[48] Louisville *Courier-Journal,* quoted in *Wisconsin Equity News,* I (1908-1909), No. 2, p. 5.

[49] Benton (Kentucky) *Tribune-Democrat,* quoted in *Wisconsin Equity News,* I (1908-1909), No. 2, p. 5.

solicited the community and obtained the support of farmers willing to eliminate the 1908 crop.[50] Many signed, fearing a reoccurrence of night riding, while others considered the proposal as feasible, believing that the pool might dispose of its surplus crop.[51]

The atmosphere in the tobacco areas was gloomy. Planters were divided, some maintaining a 1908 crop would be financially inexpedient, while others accepted the theory of crop elimination. The early months of 1908 were intense with excitement, rivaling conditions prior to the outbreak of the Civil War. Business was at a standstill.[52] Not only did the pool leaders experience difficulty in soliciting farmers' support, but similar, trying hardships were encountered in keeping up the morale of the members.[53]

Despite the innumerable obstacles that threatened to make the elimination of the 1908 crop an impossibility, there were indications that a very large percentage of the crop was to be eliminated. The estimated acreage in the Burley country fell to 18 per cent of normal and similar, sharp reductions in the dark-tobacco country were effected, causing the business receipts of the Louisville and Cincinnati markets to drop to the low figures of the previous year.[54] Western market receipts, which in

[50] Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture,* 250; Mathews, "The Farmer's Union and the Tobacco Pool," in *loc. cit.,* 488; *Wisconsin Equity News,* I (1908-1909), No. 15, p. 2. Equity claimed a membership of eight thousand in 1908.

[51] Mathews, "The Farmer's Union and the Tobacco Pool," in *loc. cit.,* 488. Among the most enthusiastic espousers of the crop elimination ideology was Cantrill, who appealed to a gathering of New Castle, Henry County, farmers in the following words: "You who are in the pool, I tell you to sit idle this year. You will get rich doing nothing. You have two crops of Burley in the pool. If you sell them for 15 cents each, there will be 25 cents coming back to you, and if you are idle there will be three years to divide it over. That will be 8 cents a pound a year. But if you grow tobacco this year the pool will be thrown on the market, and you will get only 4, or maybe 6, cents a pound for each year. Three years at 6 cents is 18 cents. Two years at 15, less cost of the pool, is 25. You will have more profit if you sit idle than if you work. But you who are not in the pool, let me say to you that if you grow tobacco enough to threaten our market, when your crop is almost ready we will dump 175,000,000 pounds of pooled tobacco on the market for what we can get. The market will drop to 2 cents or less, and you will not get enough for yours to pay to haul it to market. Now take your choice. Stand idle and help us—or we will ruin you."

[52] *Ibid.; Wisconsin Equity News,* I (1908-1909), No. 15, p. 1.

[53] *Organized Farmer,* II (1916), No. 2, p. 4.

[54] Mathewson, "Tobacco Marketing in the United States," in *loc. cit.,* 47-48; Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture,* 250-51; Taylor, "Night Riders in the Black Patch," 23. To

1889 were placed at three hundred thousand hogsheads, dwindled to approximately one hundred and ten thousand in 1909.[55]

Meanwhile, negotiations continued, but as usual all attempts at conciliation ended in failure. The independent purchasers continued their pool purchases at an average of $17 per hundred pounds. The trust, however, repeatedly refused to accept the planters' demands—which insisted that tobacco from a later year would not be sold unless the supply of the previous year was first exhausted. On one occasion the trust virtually offered to purchase the entire 1907 crop but the planters again refused, once more demanding that the earlier supply be purchased first and that some tobacco be reserved for the independent dealers who remained faithful to the farmers in the course of the crisis.[56]

On November 19 another attempt was made to mediate the differences between the two groups. After engaging in another prolonged discussion, an agreement was finally reached. Immediately the passage of some sixty million pounds of Burley tobacco, totalling approximately $12,000,000, was affected, thus ending hours of endless waiting on the part of the farmers.[57] Shortly thereafter, the dark tobacco pool was sold to put to end one of the most dramatic victories staged by the farmer in recent years.[58]

This unparalleled victory, however, was to be of temporary duration. The natural consequence accompanying the rise in tobacco prices should have been an organization of farmers on a permanent basis. The farmer to the contrary displayed a complete indifference to organization that immediately stifled all further possibilities. In Bourbon County, Kentucky, a large number of prominent farmers, who were in the fore-

regulate production, Equity established the following standards: ten thousand hills of tobacco were allowed for every man or boy over sixteen years of age; boys ranging from twelve to sixteen years were permitted five thousand hills; and women and children under twelve were not allowed any.

[55] Mathewson, "Tobacco Marketing in the United States," in *loc. cit.*, 47-48; Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture*, 250-51.

[56] *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 16, p. 2.

[57] *Ibid.* The preliminary draft of the agreement, signed by R. K. Smith and Clarence LeBus, read as follows: "The American Tobacco Company has bought seventy-five percent of the 1906 pooled tobacco at scheduled prices and seventy-five percent of the 1907 pooled tobacco at graded prices to average seventeen cents."

[58] Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture*, 251.

ground when the pooling of the 1907 crop took place, were conspicuously lacking in enthusiasm in 1909.[59] In the course of the pooling period, a number of distasteful experiences led to the disintegration of the Burley Society. First, there was a feeling of doubt on the part of many that prices could not be regulated unless production were controlled, with many maintaining control was impossible unless accompanied with violence which scarcely compensated the farmer for the hours of agony he underwent. Others insisted that restricted production in one area was not an assurance of price increases, for the deficit in one area might well be offset by increased productivity in another.[60] As one authority remarked, tobacco was marketed at a good price, but it was "achieved at too great a cost to make a repetition desirable."[61] Second, there was a feeling of distrust and suspicion on the part of the membership of both the Burley Society and the Planters' Protective Association.[62] A considerable number of the financially pressed farmers were of necessity forced to sell their warehouse receipts at sharply reduced figures, which in many instances the wealthier members of the organizations were only too glad to seize upon. This speculative enterprise proved profitable to a few; but the small and hard-pressed farmer could scarcely approve of seeing his many months of tiresome waiting go to naught. In Lyon County a group of five hundred farmers protested in a resolution that unless certain conditions were righted, they "as white, free-born citizens" would never pledge another pound of tobacco to the Planters' Protective Association.[63] Third, friction and hostility arising out of the personal and administrative differences among the officers became a disintegrating factor,[64] as was dissatisfaction over the grading

[59] Lexington *Herald,* September 20, 1909.

[60] B. H. Hibbard, *Marketing of Agricultural Products* (New York, 1921), 235.

[61] Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture,* 251.

[62] Youngman, "The Tobacco Pools of Kentucky and Tennessee," in *loc. cit.,* 41-44; Lexington *Herald,* September 28, November 2, 1908.

[63] *Wisconsin Equity News,* I (1908-1909), No. 15, p. 2.

[64] Youngman, "The Tobacco Pools of Kentucky and Tennessee," in *loc. cit.,* 41-44; Lexington *Herald,* January 18, August 9, 16, 1909. The inability of Equity and its affiliated or subsidiary organizations to carry on harmoniously characterized the history of the Society from beginning to end. Such was the case not only in Kentucky, but virtually in every state in which the organization carried on.

The American Society of Equity was incorporated as an educational organization, con-

and handling of tobacco.[65] One of the biggest disputes revolved around the salary the president of the Burley society was to receive.[66] Fourth, some of the farmers actually were of the opinion their bargaining difficulties ended with the settlement of the Burley dispute, and consequently could see no further need for organization. This element believed tobacco prices were up to stay.[67] Fifth, adverse court decisions, likewise, had a demoralizing influence. In 1909 an independent tobacco manufacturer filed suit in Federal court against officers of the Burley Society, charging the organization with conspiracy to control the white Burley market.[68] In the spring of 1910 a group of Equity farmers were convicted and fined for violating the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, by asking planters to withhold tobacco sales until a better price was obtainable. The decision in the Danbury Hatter's Case was also accepted as an ill omen, which also hastened the organization's disintegration.[69]

In 1909, following the low crop year of 1908, the Burley output skyrocketed to new heights, it being invariably the practice of farmers to stimulate production immediately following a good price year.[70] The farmers resumed their old practice of raising as much tobacco as previously, naturally assuming the combination would continue purchasing at the recent high level.[71] Though the crop and acreage production took a decided turn upward, prices did not drop to former low levels;[72] the reform in marketing methods, the rise of the export market, the dissolution of the American Tobacco Company by the United States Supreme Court, and generally rising price conditions—all served as contributing factors.

sequently, it could not engage in any marketing operations. Thus, to expedite the marketing program the farmers were obliged to form a marketing organization. Such was the case of the Burley Society in Kentucky.

[65] Lexington *Herald,* September 21, 1908.

[66] *Ibid.,* May 31, 1909.

[67] Hibbard, *Marketing of Agricultural Products,* 236.

[68] *The New International Yearbook, 1909* (New York, 1910), 405.

[69] *Wisconsin Equity News,* III (1910-1911), No. 3, p. 10; Hibbard, *Marketing of Agricultural Products,* 236; *The New International Yearbook, 1910* (New York, 1911), 401.

[70] Lexington *Herald,* January 11, 1908; February 22, November 8, 1909.

[71] Hibbard, *Marketing of Agricultural Products,* 235.

[72] Lexington *Herald,* September 28, 1908.

Despite the farmers' difficulties in combatting the trust, they succeeded in realizing certain benefits that contributed to the betterment of the tobacco market. The farmers displayed an ability to work together under proper conditions and convinced the tobacco industry they were a problem to contend with when properly organized. Funds were collected to establish warehouses and some seventeen were built. A tobacco factory was likewise started.[73]

The early Equity program did not contemplate the destruction of the trust, but rather sought to counteract its activities by organizing the farmers to meet it on an equal footing.[74] The American Tobacco Company being virtually the sole purchaser of tobacco had, by far, the advantage in its relations with the multitude of small unorganized producers, who were destitute of marketing information and bargaining power. Once an organization was achieved, the farmers, by controlling the production and the marketing of their products, could demand what they considered an equitable price. This crop restriction and price-fixing ideology still persists, having found its most recent expression in the agricultural reform policies of the New Deal. Despite the merits and demerits of the policy, we must acknowledge that it constitutes one of the programs advanced for the solution of the twentieth century agricultural problems.[75]

[73] Hibbard, *Marketing of Agricultural Products,* 238; Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture,* 251-52; John Hanna, "Agricultural Cooperation in Tobacco," in *Law and Contemporary Problems* (Durham, 1932-), I (1934), 303. Youngman, "The Tobacco Pools of Kentucky and Tennessee," in *loc. cit.,* 42, quotes from a warehouseman's letter as follows: "Before the organization of the farmers, they would sell tobacco from the barn to the speculator without knowing what it would be used for or to whom it was best suited. Consequently, a large percentage of them had no fixed idea except to grow a pound of tobacco, thinking all kinds should be worth the same money per pound. . . . Now the farmer has been educated to know that tobacco has different values, and to learn the methods of growing these different grades."

[74] Jonas, "The Night-Riders: A Trust of Farmers," in *loc. cit.,* 11214; Bache, "The Great Tobacco Strike," in *loc. cit.,* 605-606.

[75] Crop elimination and crop restriction appear crude to many of our present-day agricultural reformers. Obtaining monopolistic control of most agricultural products is next to impossible. The temporary success of the Kentucky program was due largely to a number of favorable circumstances, such as the localized character of tobacco production, the tangible nature of the grievances the farmers suffered from, the nonperishable quality of the tobacco crop, the forthcoming of local leadership as well as financial support—and the unfortunate use of violence.

Notes and Documents

Ulrich Bonnell Phillips: Historian of the South

By Fred Landon

It is not given to many men to receive from their fellows such recurring tributes of respect as have been tendered to Ulrich Bonnell Phillips in the four years that have passed since his death.[1] Already he has been accorded high place in the ranks of American historical scholarship, and in that field which he made so much his own fresh monuments to his memory arise year by year in the studies of younger men whom he inspired. There will be many appraisals of his work in the days to come because in printed page it lies open to the reader. The man himself, teacher, scholar, friend, will also remain clear-cut in the memory of those who worked under his guidance or were associated with him in historical activities. Such impressions and memories as are here recorded are set down less for those who knew him than in the hope that some glimpses of his personality may give greater interest and meaning to his writings. It would be a happy circumstance if not one but many of those who knew Phillips would set down each his own remembrances of the man. The details of the picture might vary but from all would come the recollection of a man who, in addition to being a great scholar, was also great in character, in friendship, and in understanding of his fellows. The writer acknowledges the honor of being asked by the program committee of the Southern Historical Association to prepare this paper, and for what may seem to be of personal nature in the narrative asks the reader's indulgence.

It may be of interest first of all to point out that among the English

[1] This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association in New Orleans, November 5, 1938.

speaking people of Canada there has long been a marked interest in the history of the South. For this interest various explanations might be offered. A common British ancestry is scarcely enough to account for it. The continuous arrival of runaway slaves in Upper Canada after 1815 may be mentioned as one source of interest. Though Canadian sympathies, like those of the people of England, were of mixed character during the Civil War, there was a minor link with the South in the presence in Upper Canada (Ontario) of many Southern families sent far North while the men were on active service. Even to this day family names may be found in Ontario which have a distinct flavor of old Charleston and of other portions of the South. The importance of the Civil War itself as a factor in the evolution of the Dominion of Canada is a well-recognized fact in Canadian history. It is not too much to say that the Dominion of Canada was a by-product of the Civil War.

It was through correspondence over some phases of these Canadian-American relations that the writer was first brought into touch with Phillips soon after the close of the Great War. His *American Negro Slavery* had already appeared, and he was even then becoming interested in studies of the reaction of slavery upon public opinion outside the bounds of the South, even in Canada. He suggested that the Canadian conceptions of the Southern economy, particularly slavery, ought to be studied in the same way that he hoped to see the Northern point of view investigated in selected areas during certain definite periods. Had his life not been cut short these subjects would doubtless have come increasingly within the range of his own careful inquiry and thought. In later years he gave encouragement to this broadened conception of Southern history, as was shown by his interest in the work of Gilbert H. Barnes on the abolitionist crusade. One may challenge the statement that "He was never able to fit the abolitionist movement into its proper niche in the sectional problem because he lacked an adequate understanding of northern trends in the period."[2] If he was not able to fit it into its proper niche it was because he had discerned that acccepted explanations of the rise of the abolitionist movement were inadequate

[2] Wood Gray, "Ulrich Bonnell Phillips," in William T. Hutchinson (ed.), *The Marcus W. Jernegan Essays in American Historiography* (Chicago, 1937), 371.

and he himself suggested the inquiry which has given a new and more satisfactory explanation of the movement than any that preceded it.[3] He had long felt that the whole record of antislavery and abolitionist activities needed serious revision, a view with which most American historians would still be in agreement. It was the writer's privilege to be present during a reading of the Barnes thesis while it was in manuscript and to have some slight part in the discussion of its conclusions. Without minimizing too greatly the influence of personalities in the abolitionist movement, William Lloyd Garrison for example, Phillips had become convinced that some powerful force not hitherto properly appreciated had worked upon the Northern mind to produce the crusade against slavery. At that time the letters and papers of Theodore Dwight Weld had not yet been discovered, and one may imagine the satisfaction which came when a large amount of documentary material turned up to corroborate and amplify the view which he had long since entertained.[4]

Phillips' later years at the University of Michigan may properly be regarded as among the happiest and most productive of his career. His rank in the profession was well established and honors of one kind and another came in rapid succession. A personal reminiscence may be offered at this point. On a spring afternoon in 1929, in acceptance of an invitation to spend a few days as his guest, I walked with him from the University Club to his home where we joined his children on the lawn. At the supper table there seemed to be an air of suppressed gaiety. Finally he broke into a rollicking laugh and said to Mrs. Phillips, "Tell him the news."

The news was that during the afternoon a message had come from the Albert Kahn Foundation tendering one of its fellowships for a year of foreign travel. This honor followed closely upon the award by Little, Brown and Company of the prize of $2,500 offered for the best unpublished work on American history. In the evening the whole

[3] Gilbert H. Barnes, *The Antislavery Impulse, 1830-1844* (New York, 1933).

[4] The Weld Papers were later published in part in Gilbert H. Barnes and Dwight L. Dumond (eds.), *The Letters of Theodore Dwight Weld, Angelina Grimké Weld and Sarah Grimké,* 2 vols. (New York, 1934).

household went to the telegraph office to compose the reply of acceptance, following which a visit to a movie was added to celebrate the award.

There was a fine hospitality in the Phillips home at Ann Arbor. The large living room, with its great fireplace at one end, saw many a gathering of groups of workers in the field of history. During a meeting of the American Historical Association one such group enjoyed a most hilarious hour as Phillips discoursed in burlesque fashion on his alleged discovery of a rare piece of military biography. For others there are memories of quieter evenings when there was much good talk and sober discussion of the work done and being done in American history. At the risk of seeming to intrude upon the more personal side, mention might be made of the happy family life in which the guest was always given opportunity to join. An old-fashioned courtesy prevailed, with much merry laughter and banter between parents and children.

Phillips had the same zest for manuscripts that a fisherman might have for a trout stream. He was never happier than when on the trail of some hitherto unknown and unexplored cache, and his friend Herbert A. Kellar has recorded most interestingly some of their amusing adventures while on such quests in Virginia. He had himself gathered together an extensive collection of books and manuscripts, much of which passed into the Yale University Library after his death. His notes filled several filing cabinets and were kept in most orderly fashion. They were begun when, as a student assistant in the library of the University of Georgia where he was working for his master's degree, he was assigned the task of arranging a large lot of newspapers. While putting them in order he also examined their contents, made copious notes, and incidentally nearly ruined his eyesight. It was the eyestrain thus occasioned which forced him to withdraw for a time from college, a period during which he made his memorable essay as a cotton planter, an episode which is described in his *Life and Labor in the Old South.*

The use which he made of this personal experience in agriculture illustrates his manner of drawing upon the contemporary scene to throw light upon the past. He felt that too many historians became so occu-

pied in their research that they lost all contact with daily life and consequently could give no real meaning to the masses of facts which they so industriously collected. Phillips was no cloistered scholar. He lived and moved among men and knew that from the humblest and most illiterate there might come some illumination of the life of the past which he was seeking to interpret. One of his friends recalls an occasion when Phillips was the guest of a railroad attorney in a Southern city and with several hours before a dinner engagement was asked what he would like to do. He suggested that the ablest Negro preacher in the city might be brought in. This was done and for two hours or more his questions brought for him and for the others who were listeners interesting glimpses of the Negro mind in relation to the various subjects which were discussed. A Canadian friend who traveled with him from a historical gathering in the Middle West recalls that as they sat together at night in the smoking compartment the talk naturally turned upon the Negro in America. A porter who entered seemed to spend an unusually long time in his polishing duties. By and by another black face was at the door and then a third, all intently listening to the discussion, their presence and interest in no way resented by Phillips. His service during the World War in one of the cantonments in the South where Negro troops received training gave him interesting new glimpses of the African in America, and when the Kahn Foundation's fellowship provided him with both the time and the means to do what he pleased for a year in other countries his decision was quickly taken. He would go to Africa and there see the Negro race on its own continent, living even yet in some areas under conditions similar to those of the earliest forbears of the Negro in America. Here were human documents, as important for a true understanding of his subject as the most authentic letters and diaries and account books.

Phillips' use of the manuscript material which came before him showed fine discrimination. He was not deceived by the window dressing which so often characterizes the correspondence of political leaders. He recognized the value of the familiar correspondence of comparatively obscure persons as often a more trustworthy clue to public

opinion than official documents. American history had, he thought, been written too much upon the basis of what great men said on the public platform or wrote in an official capacity. He sought the facts of history in more lowly places and the use which he made of planters' diaries and account books and of the private letters of individual farmers is both interesting and instructive. It is easy to imagine the anticipation with which he visited "Shirley," the old Carter home on the James River, on a day in 1916 and had set before him for perusal the three large volumes of Hill Carter's diary, running from 1816 to 1851, and the volume of overseer's accounts from 1832 to 1845.[5] But he could be thrilled equally by the illiterate writings of obscure individuals who, quite unconscious of the fact that they were providing the sources of history, set down in simple and artless phrases the happenings about them.[6]

Broadened and deepened knowledge of the field of history which he cultivated so assiduously was accompanied in the case of Phillips by an ever higher standard of literary presentation which reached its peak in his *Life and Labor in the Old South.* In the preface to the book he refers modestly to his own work, contrasting it with that of other writers less restricted by records and whose imagination could have free rein. "In the main I am content to delve rather than try to soar," he wrote, yet from the first page of the book where he says, "Let us begin by discussing the weather," there is not a dull page. The improvements in style which characterized his later writings came by dint of hard work. Phillips composed slowly and revised continuously. There are passages in his later work which are almost musical in their flow and choice of words. He loved to search for and find if possible that word which above all others expressed exactly the idea that was in his mind. The well-worn dictionary which was so prominent in his study had become so by the touch of his hands. His students were sometimes amused by his frequent use of the word "copious," a very excellent word by the way, but which seemed to be for him a special favorite. He used it in

[5] Ulrich B. Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South* (Boston, 1929), 229.
[6] *Ibid.,* Chap. XVII, "The Plain People."

familiar conversation and in lecturing, and it constantly recurs in his writings. Young scholars, seeking a model for historical composition, might learn much from his writings and profit also by examination of his use of footnotes. He himself thought that Edward Channing was a model in this latter branch of the writer's craft. Those who studied under Phillips soon came also to know of his deep interest in maps and to learn of his own experiments in map making.[7] In his investigations of economic and political matters he had found that setting the facts in map form gave a conspectus not otherwise easy to secure and often provided interpretations more valid than those otherwise obtained.

Phillips valued highly the respect and affection of those able students who from year to year came under his direction. He himself retained such an affection for Frederick Jackson Turner, his former colleague, and appreciated those instances where he himself had been an inspiration to good work and found that inspiration acknowledged. He had no patience with those who sought by easy methods to seem to have that which could only come through diligence and perseverance. He was a man ever ready and willing to work with others. In the American Historical Association, in the Agricultural History Society, and in like organizations he was prepared at all times to do his part in furthering the objectives. To the very last of life, even in the midst of poignant suffering, he concerned himself with his responsibilities as teacher and counselor.

In personal appearance Phillips was tall and well-made. He was fair of skin and ruddy of countenance. His smile gave an impression of bashfulness but he had a marked dignity of presence and manner. When lecturing to undergraduate classes he sat at his desk, used no notes as a rule, and spoke in a quiet, measured fashion. He was more in his element when meeting the smaller seminar groups. There he would pose question after question in searching fashion, determining how thoroughly the individual had followed his inquiry. He was not a good extemporaneous public speaker but his written papers were presented in excellent style and voice.

[7] For example, see the economic map of the South in 1860 which appears in *ibid.*

His last days were followed with sad hearts by those who were his associates and friends. A group in attendance at the Urbana meeting of the American Historical Association sent him a message of greeting and cheer during what were his last days. But he was not cast down, even with the shadows so close around him. He had lived richly, he had enriched the lives of others, and at the last he could have said, with Lord Bacon, "a mind fixed upon something that is good doth avert the dolors of death." Steps have already been taken to bring together a collection of essays by former students which will be their tribute to the memory of an inspiring teacher and a friend, one who lived in a spacious atmosphere and gave freshness and life to fields of history which narrow minds and prejudice had long muddied. In that volume it is to be hoped that there will be such adequate portrayal of the personality of Ulrich Phillips as shall preserve him a living figure to those who come after us who knew him.

SOUTHERN DESIGNS ON CUBA, 1854-1857 AND SOME EUROPEAN OPINIONS

Edited by GAVIN B. HENDERSON

The persistent bickering that disfigured Anglo-American relations during the nineteenth century was in one of its worst phases during the Crimean War period. The United States government was very suspicious of the Anglo-French alliance which, it was feared, might lead to co-operation in trans-Atlantic matters. On January 31, 1854, Lord Clarendon, the British foreign minister, made a speech in the House of Lords in which he declared: "the union between the two Governments has not been confined to the Eastern question. The happy accord and good understanding between France and England have been extended beyond Eastern policy to the policy affecting all parts of the world, and . . . there is no portion of the two hemispheres with regard to which the policy of the two countries, however heretofore antagonistic,

His last days were followed with sad hearts by those who were his associates and friends. A group in attendance at the Urbana meeting of the American Historical Association sent him a message of greeting and cheer during what were his last days. But he was not cast down, even with the shadows so close around him. He had lived richly, he had enriched the lives of others, and at the last he could have said, with Lord Bacon, "a mind fixed upon something that is good doth avert the dolors of death." Steps have already been taken to bring together a collection of essays by former students which will be their tribute to the memory of an inspiring teacher and a friend, one who lived in a spacious atmosphere and gave freshness and life to fields of history which narrow minds and prejudice had long muddied. In that volume it is to be hoped that there will be such adequate portrayal of the personality of Ulrich Phillips as shall preserve him a living figure to those who come after us who knew him.

SOUTHERN DESIGNS ON CUBA, 1854-1857 AND SOME EUROPEAN OPINIONS

Edited by GAVIN B. HENDERSON

The persistent bickering that disfigured Anglo-American relations during the nineteenth century was in one of its worst phases during the Crimean War period. The United States government was very suspicious of the Anglo-French alliance which, it was feared, might lead to co-operation in trans-Atlantic matters. On January 31, 1854, Lord Clarendon, the British foreign minister, made a speech in the House of Lords in which he declared: "the union between the two Governments has not been confined to the Eastern question. The happy accord and good understanding between France and England have been extended beyond Eastern policy to the policy affecting all parts of the world, and . . . there is no portion of the two hemispheres with regard to which the policy of the two countries, however heretofore antagonistic,

is not now in entire harmony." It is clear that these unimpeachable sentiments referred to the efforts of the two governments to bring to an end the traditional rivalry between French and British agents in all parts of the world. But the United States professed to see something specifically hostile to themselves in these words; and they considered the case proven when France refused to permit Pierre Soulé, American minister in Madrid, to pass through French territory on his way to Spain.

Meanwhile, there were numerous outstanding differences between Britain and the United States. The Oregon frontier, the Newfoundland fisheries, the Falkland Islands, and the Mosquito Coast—all provided material for diplomatic controversy. The American bombardment of Greytown and the project of annexing the Sandwich Islands added fuel to the flames. With Russia, on the other hand, there were no points of difference; and, throughout the Crimean War, the United States government was favorable to the Czar.[1] The American people fully agreed with their government. There were rejoicings in the United States when it was learned that the rumor of the fall of Sebastopol was false.[2] In December, 1854, the Mayor of New York and the District Attorney attended a meeting to present an address to Smith O'Brien on his return from Van Dieman's Land. Strongly anti-British speeches were made, and three cheers were given for the Czar of Russia.[3]

The strength of these anti-British feelings in the Northern, Central, and Western states of the Union seemed to provide a suitable opportunity for certain Southerners to carry through one of their dearest ambitions: namely, the acquisition of Cuba. This beautiful and wealthy island was not only of strategic and economic importance; it was of very special importance to Southern expansionists, who thought its

[1] See Frank A. Golder, "Russian-American Relations during the Crimean War," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXXI (1926), 462-76.

[2] Clarendon, British foreign secretary, to Aberdeen, prime minister, November 6, 1854, in Arthur Hamilton-Gordon (ed.), *Selections from the Correspondence of George, Earl of Aberdeen* (privately printed), Vol. for 1854-1855 (1885), 271. There is a copy of this rare series, which was printed for private circulation, in the manuscript room of the British Museum, which contains also the Aberdeen Papers in manuscript form.

[3] Crampton to Clarendon, December 25, 1854, and enclosure from the New York *Herald,* Public Record Office, Foreign Office 5/600. Cited hereafter as P. R. O., F. O.

acquisition would greatly strengthen that slave-economy which they were determined to preserve at all costs. Everything seemed to make 1854 or 1855 a suitable time for the attempt. Spain was even weaker and more revolution-ridden than usual, and her despicable monarchy appeared on the verge of collapse. Britain and France—chief rivals of the United States in the Caribbean—were fully occupied elsewhere. A powerful effort was therefore made to convert the policy of the Southern expansionists into the policy of the Union itself.

Soulé, the firebrand United States minister in Madrid, appears to have been the leading spirit in this affair. He persuaded William L. Marcy to call a "conference" of the United States ministers accredited to the courts of London, Paris, and Madrid—namely, James Buchanan, John Y. Mason, and Soulé. Mason and Soulé were Southerners; Buchanan, though a Pennsylvanian, was a Democrat, and in full sympathy with them. "Never did I obey any instructions so reluctantly," wrote Buchanan later, ". . . and yet I continue to be entirely satisfied with our reports."[4] The three ministers met at Ostend on October 9, 10, and 11, 1854. Another Southern diplomat, Dudley Mann, was in Ostend, and seems to have been consulted.[5] From Ostend, the three ministers proceeded to Aix-la-Chapelle, where they produced a report (dated October 18) commonly known as the Ostend Manifesto. This report declared that the acquisition of Cuba by the United States, by purchase or by any other method, was a foregone conclusion; and that, if any other great power were to indicate an objection to such a plan, this should be regarded as a mere impertinence.[6] The conference, and the

[4] James Buchanan to William L. Marcy, December 22, 1854, in John B. Moore (ed.), *The Works of James Buchanan, Comprising his Speeches, State Papers, and Private Correspondence,* 12 vols. (New York, 1908-1911), IX, 289.

[5] Van Iseghem, Hanoverian consul in Ostend, wrote to von Lenthe, Hanoverian foreign minister, on October 12, 1854 (No. 148) that the three ministers were "accompanied by several secretaries or attachés, and by Mr Dudley Mann, a member of the American cabinet." Hannover Staatsarchiv, Hannover 9 Türkei 27E. It seems doubtful whether Mann's presence was a pure coincidence or not. For Mann, see *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), IV (1938), 219, n. 15.

[6] See Moore (ed.), *Works of James Buchanan,* IX, 260-74, for the text of the Ostend Manifesto. In Britain this was of course regarded as a piece of "unparalleled audacity." See, for example, W. R. Greg, *Rocks Ahead, or the Warnings of Cassandra* (London, 1874), 208, 216.

report, were highly irregular: it was Southern policy, not Union policy, that was being expressed so forcibly. The authorities at Washington seem to have given the Southern diplomats freedom of expression with a view to testing opinion at home and abroad. But the gentlemen of the South had on this occasion gone too far: their report gave deep offence to the Free Soil party, which recognized that it adopted "the highwayman's plea, that might makes right."[7] Pierce and Marcy, though always anxious to do a bad turn to Britain or a good turn to Russia, dared not give their full support to the Southern designs on Cuba,[8] and, as a result, the opportunity of the Crimean War was lost. For the meanwhile, Cuba remained Spanish.

The Cuban question naturally excited interest in diplomatic and political circles in Europe, and particularly in Britain. Nowhere in Britain was there any sympathy for Southern aspirations until the noble struggle of the Confederacy attracted widespread admiration, though little concrete support. In the days of the Crimean War, Southern designs on Cuba and United States friendship with Russia were alike regarded as a base betrayal of democratic principles. In 1812-1814, when Britain was engaged in a desperate struggle against the autocrat, Napoleon, the United States—which had revolted in the name of liberty—had fought on the side of despotism. Such, at least, was the British interpretation. In 1854-1855 Britain was again engaged in a desperate struggle against an autocrat—and again the United States favored the upholder of despotism. Hence the British people—of all classes—were led to the conclusion that the great Republic of the West was not a true believer in democratic principles. And the explanation that naturally sprang to the mind was that a slave-economy was inherently incapable of being truly

[7] The Free Soilers, and even more the abolitionists, were most despondent even before the publication of the Ostend Manifesto. On August 7, 1854, Wendell Phillips wrote to Mrs. Elizabeth Pease Nichol: ". . . the *Government* has fallen into the hands of the Slave Power *completely*. So far as *national* politics are concerned, we are beaten—there's no hope. We shall have Cuba in a year or two, Mexico in five." See W. P. Garrison and F. J. Garrison (eds.), *William Lloyd Garrison, 1805-1879, The Story of His Life Told by His Children*, 4 vols. (New York, 1885-1889) III, 411.

[8] John A. Quitman, who was organizing an expedition against Cuba, was forced to pay some regard to the neutrality laws. But he was rewarded for his illegal activities with a seat in Congress.

democratic; and that, so long as the South had a powerful influence on the policy of the United States, that policy was certain to be antidemocratic and anti-British. The Southern hunger for Cuba was one of many factors responsible for building up this line of argument which, though largely mistaken, contained some elements of truth. A body of opinion developed in Britain which believed not only that Southerners were wicked men, because they practiced and justified slavery, but also that they were peculiarly anti-British, since Britain had freed her slaves and loved liberty. This complacent fantasy, which finds some slight justification in the irresponsibilities of the Ostend Manifesto, was not without importance, for it had significant results. Had British opinion been more pro-Southern in the days of the Confederacy the course of the struggle might have been altered.

It is therefore thought useful to print certain dispatches and letters to illustrate the course of events in Cuba, and the state of opinion in Europe, in the years 1854-1857. A number of dispatches from British representatives abroad have been selected from the British Public Record Office. Use has also been made of material from the private Clarendon Papers.[9] These documents may be regarded as supplementing the text of the Ostend Manifesto which is, however, too easily accessible to need reproduction here.

W. H. HOLDERNESS TO PALMERSTON, ADAMS COUNTY, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 22, 1854[10]

Your good sense will of course excuse any lack of etiquette that there may appear to be in this epistle especially as it comes from a resident on the Western side of the Atlantic, where courtly forms have not yet been introduced. I have just received information of matters that deeply concern, as I think, the whole of Europe, especially Spain. There is an expedition of immense magnitude now on foot in the United States for the subjugation of Cuba. General [John A.] Quitman is at the head of it. It is secretly organized, chiefly throughout the Slave States. General Quitman proposes raising 200000 men, of which I have been informed that 150000 are enrolled already. The place of rendezvous is New Or-

[9] I am indebted to Lord Clarendon for permission to make use of material from his family papers.

[10] P.R.O., F.O. America Domestic/611. The letter is marked "Private."

leans, where they also purpose to embark for their descent on the Island. The time they purpose for their expedition is next February.[11] The late conduct of the United States Government leaves no doubt that they will connive at it. You may depend on my information being correct. I had it from one who has been among the conspirators, and has seen their arms, a good part of which are revolving rifles, of seven barrels together. I have no motive that I know in giving this information, but to prevent, if possible, the consummation of as dark a piece of villainy as can disgrace the 19th century, to be carried out under the hypocritical pretext of enlarging the area of freedom. Beyond this communication, I wish not to be known in the matter.[12]

HOWDEN (BRITISH AMBASSADOR IN MADRID) TO CLARENDON (BRITISH FOREIGN MINISTER), NO. 269, OCTOBER 23, 1854[13]

I have just seen a private letter from Mr Soulé, dated Aix la Chapelle the 12th instant, in which he says that his absence from Madrid was never a Leave but "a grave and momentous Mission". He alludes no doubt to the Congress of American Ministers.

I have no doubt that in this Congress not only the republicanizing of Spain, but the republicanizing of Europe as a result, was debated. I gather this from the answer of the present Chargé d'Affaires here, Mr [Horatio J.] Perry, to Mr Soulé's letter.

Mr Soulé overwhelms Mr Perry with abuse for even the common terms of amity on which he has very wisely kept with the Spanish Government and its members. Mr Perry read me his reply, and I must say of the composition of this young man that it is one of the most earnest, right-minded and really eloquent productions I ever met.

In one part, to which I have alluded, Mr Perry says "You will fail in your objects, *nor will you have the consolation of pulling down Empires with you,*— it is my business to tell you the truth even if my destiny be in your hands. You have not a single real friend here, and I should be still more correct in saying that, excepting the Queen Mother, you are the being most hated in Spain."

It is really an astonishing fact, if the American President and Foreign Secretary do not approve of Mr Soulé's acts that they should allow him to jeopardise the wiser policy of the United States by what he may be inclined now to say or do. The letter I read was hot with anger, ambition, and vanity, and pregnant

[11] February, 1855, was in fact the critical month. See subsequent documents.

[12] This letter was communicated by Clarendon, British foreign secretary, to Crampton, British minister in Washington, on November 2, 1854. No. 246, F.O. 5 America/592.

[13] P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/846. In a pencil note Clarendon instructed a copy of the above to be sent to Washington to Crampton "who will take care that Mr P's name is not divulged as holding commun^{n} with L^{d} H."

with some great scheme. I learn that he counts on the out and out support in the American cabinet of Messieurs [Caleb] Cushing and [Jefferson] Davis.

It is very possible that all this violence, by its very excess, may defeat itself.

SEAFORD (BRITISH CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES IN BRUSSELS) TO LORD CLARENDON, NOVEMBER 1, 1854[14]

At a visit I paid yesterday to the chargé d'affaires of the United States, he let fall a few words which may not be uninteresting to Your Lordship, at the present moment, though they occurred in a conversation quite of a private and friendly character.

We were talking of the occurrences of the day, and I alluded to the incalculable importance and results to Europe of the alliance between France and England, when Mr [J. J.] Seibels remarked: "True as regards Europe but yet we do not *quite* like it in the United States."

I expressed my surprise asking how this could be, whether we had not their sympathy in our struggle with Russia, adding that I had been under the impression not only that their relations were excellent with us, but that there was always a special leaning on their part towards France.

He quite assented to this, but replied "there was a speech of Lord Clarendon's which has created great sensation and dissatisfaction with us."

I replied "surely there must be some mistake, as I never recollect Lord Clarendon saying anything of a nature which could be taken ill by the United States, and indeed I am sure that he could not really have said anything of the kind from my knowledge of his sentiments towards your country." Mr Seibels explained that it was by no means any expression of Your Lordship *distinctly directed* against them which had caused irritation but that in a speech in which you had alluded to the *immediate* importance to *Europe* of the actual alliance between France and England, you had given utterance to the expression of a confidence of this alliance being of a *permanent* nature, and *as such* attended with advantages to the *World*.

He added that they (in the United States) took this as a sort of menace to the United States, or at least intention to thwart them, and he went on to say "you know we want and must have Cuba, and we know that France, when acting with England, would oppose us."

I remarked "of course your territory is large enough for your prosperity, and your power is as great as it need be for self defence and for consideration as a leading people among nations, but your aggrandizement would in the opinion of many Countries render you dangerous to the peace of the World, but, I went on to say, as connected with Cuba a great principle of civilisation (to which the whole population of France and England attach the greatest importance)

[14] P.R.O., F.O. 10 Belgium/182. The letter is marked "Private."

was *at least apparently involved,* that is the question of Slavery. There is, as you know, a reasonable expectation that something will be done by Spain towards the abolition of Slavery. Now we look upon the object of your policy in desiring to obtain possession of Cuba to be that of *the perpetuation* of Slavery. We know the dangerous character to you of the struggle going on between your Slave and Free States, and the project of transporting all your Slaves to Cuba, and indemnifying the Southern-States Slave owners by grants in Cuba (whether feasible or not) has been so often put forward, that credence is attached to what I have said was the apprehension would result from the occupation of Cuba." Mr Seibels laughed, and said he knew what was said in the United States and what was felt in England upon that subject, and he admitted the danger of the Slavery question as it now stood with them.

I then turned the conversation to the Meeting of the United States Ministers in what has been called "Congress" in Europe, thinking that I might learn something of the object, and whether the question of Cuba (that is to say the opportunity of making a dash at Cuba, as has been suspected) might have formed matter for deliberation, but he told me he had not been party to the meeting anywhere, and he was quite reserved upon the subject, if he knew in fact anything of the proceedings of this Assemblage of the United States Representatives.

Although I do not attach any special importance to what fell from Mr Seibels, yet being a thorough American and a Slave Owner, the sentiments he expressed to me are fairly to be looked upon as genuine, and as indicating correctly those of certain classes in the United States at this moment.

HOWDEN TO CLARENDON, NO. 299, MADRID, NOVEMBER 10, 1854[15]

There is expressed by all the Ministers, declared by all the journals, and believed by all the Publick, a *confident expectation* that England will protect Cuba against the Americans, and the present Policy of Spain itself against any power or party that attacks it. The strength of Spain as regards the rest of Europe has been long that of a woman:— She knows that she is too weak to be struck. . . . I cannot divest myself of the conviction that Cuba is destined to become, before long, a serious embarrassment not only for the Mother Country but for England. I am sure that Spain rests her expectation of retaining the Island *entirely* on England and France: She says (perhaps she says rightly) that the English Antilles make Cuba as much an English as a Spanish question, but I earnestly request Your Lordship to believe that the result of this argumentation is that Spain will never be even grateful for the protection of England, or do anything to merit it. . . .

[15] P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/847. There was more than one opinion in the British cabinet as to whether "the English Antilles make Cuba as much an English as a Spanish question." On December 9 Lord John Russell wrote to Clarendon: "This Washington chit-chat seems to me rather probable, and agrees with what 'Old Buck' [Buchanan] has said here. I think

DRAFT: CLARENDON TO LORD HOWARD DE WALDEN (BRITISH AMBASSADOR IN BELGIUM), NOVEMBER 11, 1854[16]

I have received Your Lordship's Despatch marked "Private" of the 1st instant giving an account of a Conversation which you had on the 31st ultimo with the Chargé d'Affaires of the United States at Brussels; and I have to acquaint you that I approve the language which Your Lordship held on that occasion. I am well aware of the objection taken in the United States to a passage in a speech of mine at the beginning of last Session, and I have explained frequently both to the American Minister here as well as to Mr [John F. T. C.] Crampton that no reference to the United States whatever, direct or indirect, was intended nor was in my mind at the time, and that I merely alluded to the joint Missions of England and France to some of the South American States.

In justification of the views entertained by certain Parties in the United States respecting Cuba, the most absurd rumours had been industriously circulated of the intention of Her Majesty's Govt. to "Africanize" Cuba, and that negotiations were actually in progress for the emancipation of the Slaves in that Island, but the only desire of Her Majesty's Government is that Cuba should remain in the possession of its lawful sovereign while their communications to the Spanish Govt. have been confined to remonstrances against the perpetual violations of the Treaty between Great Britain and Spain for abolishing the Slave Trade.

You will, in the manner you may think most expedient, make this known to your American colleague.

HOWDEN TO CLARENDON, NO. 301, MADRID, NOVEMBER 12, 1854[17]

Some time ago I told Your Lordship that I felt almost convinced that Mr Soulé had entered into no contract either with the Queen Mother or the late Government for the sale of Cuba, but I have very great reason to believe that a contract was not only projected but even prepared between Mr Soulé and Señores [José Maria] Orense and Ordax Avecilla, the heads of the Republican Party here, for the sale of the Island whenever, through Mr Soulé's assistance and the money supplied by the United States, that party came into power.

That this idea, and even more than an idea, was discussed, I can almost posi-

we should try to come to an understanding with France about Cuba. If Spain sells it, let her. If Cuba revolts, let it. But if Pierce attempts to take Cuba by force I should not allow it." Clarendon Papers. Hence Russell did not object to a United States acquisition *in itself*, e.g., by purchase; but he objected to its acquisition *by violence*—an acquisition which might encourage Southern filibusters to start operations on British colonial possessions.

[16] P.R.O., F.O. 10 Belgium/179. The letter is marked "Separate and Private." There is a marginal note as follows: "Should not this await till Lord H. de Walden returns? Yes, but it may be sent to Ld. H. at Paris and to care of Ld. Cowley. C[larendon]."

[17] P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/847.

tively inform Your Lordship, but as far as my experience goes of the feeling of this Country at large, a feeling entertained very widely by people of all parties, even by those who are most democratick in their opinions, I can not think this Sale would ever be executed with the sanction of a Representative assembly by any Ministry under any form of government.

HOWDEN TO CLARENDON, NO. 349, DECEMBER 13, 1854[18]

[Howden gives a more friendly account of Soulé, and continues:] In speaking of Cuba, Mr Soulé said he did not think there would be any more filibustering attacks, but that the universal feeling of the Country would force its acquisition on the Government; that the Government would be absolutely obliged to do so in its own defence, in order to allay a universal and overpowering excitement, in the same way that, by every law natural or made, a man was justified in knocking down his neighbour's wall to put out a fire which threatened the conflagration of his property.

CRAMPTON TO CLARENDON, NO. 20, JANUARY 22, 1855[19]

I have the honour to inform your Lordship that M. Pierre Soulé, Minister from the United States to Spain, has resigned his appointment and that Mr John C. Breckenridge [*sic*] of Kentucky has been named by the President to be M. Soulé's successor. This appointment has been confirmed by the Senate.

Mr Breckenridge who has represented a district of the State of Kentucky in the House of Representatives, although comparatively a young man, has gained a respectable standing in Congress and is a person of good character and conciliatory manners. He has never that I am aware of committed himself publickly or privately to any political opinions regarding the relations between this Country and Spain, which could fairly give umbrage to the Government of Her Most Christian Majesty.

ARTHUR FANSHAWE (BRITISH ADMIRAL) TO CRAMPTON, HAVANA, FEBRUARY 6, 1855[20]

I arrived here on the 1st inst with the "Colossus". I have had a very cordial reception from the Captain General and Spanish Authorities and he has given me to understand my visit is an opportune one, as he had reason, from information he had received, to expect the arrival of a filibustering expedition under Colonel Quitman,—and certainly since my arrival there have been some symptoms of activity with the Spanish Squadron and troops. A frigate, two brigs and

[18] P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/848. Soulé's simile about a conflagration is an echo of the terms of the Ostend Manifesto.

[19] P.R.O., F.O. 5 America/619.

[20] P.R.O., F.O. 5 America/619. Crampton sent this letter to Clarendon and in his covering letter, dated February 18, 1855, No. 36, he says that, in spite of all American pro-

three steamers have gone to sea, taking the General second in command and some troops. General [José de la] Concha assures me he is well prepared to receive them, he would only wish to be sure of the point of debarkation.

My own opinion is that these movements have more reference to some apprehended *insurrection* in the Island than invasion.

The American Consul tells me he has assured the Captain General [Concha] his apprehensions are groundless—that the President is entirely adverse to any filibustering and that the adventurers have exhausted their funds and Mr[A. C.] Crawford says he has heard nothing from any of his Brother-Consuls in the States. The Spanish Squadron, and I may say also the Spanish troops, appear in a much more efficient state than any I have seen for a long time. . . .

CRAWFORD (BRITISH CONSUL IN HAVANA) TO CLARENDON, NO. 11, FEBRUARY 10, 1855[21]

I have to report to Your Lordship that a plot for the subversion of the Government and of Spanish Rule in this Island has been discovered, and numerous persons have been arrested here and elsewhere who are said to be implicated in the conspiracy. So completely effectual have been the measures of General Concha on this occasion, that the papers of those arrested were seized and I understand have been found to disclose a plan in combination with an expedition which was to have sailed about this time from certain parts of the United States in aid of the insurrectionists in the Island, as well as that there have been considerable depots of arms and ammunition established at various places, which were brought from America, the money for the purposes of the conspirators having been furnished by those engaged in it here and elsewhere in Cuba to a large amount.

These arrests were made on Tuesday last the 6th instant at all places simultaneously and some sixty persons have been made prisoners, chiefly Creoles, but there are several Spaniards amongst them. I have not heard that any foreigners have been taken, although it is said that emissaries from the United States are at various places, they have managed until now to avoid capture.

The parties accused are to be tried by the Military Commission and General Concha has assured me that he feels perfectly secure as to any consequences which might result even if the whole force estimated at 2300 or 2600 men were to effect a landing, as he is prepared for them at all points.

I have the honour of transmitting to Your Lordship the Diario of today, which republishes an official notice published by the Captain General which appeared in yesterday's Gazette upon this subject, and also some particulars of

testations, "I fear there can be little doubt that had the proposed insurrection in Cuba been even partially successful no efforts of the United States Govt. could have prevented the departure of numbers of persons from this country to join its ranks."

[21] P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/878.

the Filibuster Expedition which it appears was to have come from Texas, Savannah, and New York.

The public tranquillity has in no way been disturbed in the Island, and the Manifesto of the Captain General has in a great degree tended to calm the alarm which could not fail to have been produced by the action of the Government which has been so energetically displayed.

Rear-Admiral Fanshawe C. B. arrived here on the 1st Instant in the "Boscawen" 72, accompanied by the "Colossus" 81. The "Espiegle" 12 was in port, and "Vestal" 26 has since arrived. The Colossus sailed yesterday on her return to England.

The Commander in Chief of Her Majesty's Naval Forces in these Seas has met a most cordial reception, and the presence of our Fleet here at so critical a moment cannot fail to have been exceedingly opportune and agreeable to His Excellency the Captain General by its moral effect, which I believe General Concha has acknowledged and expressed to Admiral Fanshawe who will remain until he receives his Despatches by H. M.'s Steamer "Medea" expected in a few days from Jamaica.

CRAWFORD TO CLARENDON, NO. 12, FEBRUARY 14, 1855[22]

With reference to my last despatch No. 11 of the 10th Instant and inclosure I have now to report that General Concha has declared the Island to be in a State of Siege and the whole of the Coast and Islands adjacent to be blockaded by the Spanish Naval Forces. . . .

Those measures have been resorted to, as I understand, in consequence of information which the Captain-General has received which leads him to apprehend that a part of the Expedition, which it was said was ready to leave the United States, had actually sailed.

Admiral Fanshawe had an interview with General Concha yesterday after the "Bandos" were published and His Excellency stated that there was no doubt of a considerable part of the piratical forces having left New Orleans and Galveston, which required him to reinforce the Spanish Garrison at Trinidad and he applied to the Admiral for a steamer to convey troops from hence to that place.

In consequence of the official request which was addressed to him for that purpose, Admiral Fanshawe placed Her Majesty's Steamer Sloop Medea at His Excellency's disposition, and having embarked a wing of the Regiment of Iberia, the Medea sailed today at noon for Trinidad, from whence Commander Phillimore has orders to return as soon as said troops have been disembarked. . . .

[22] P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/878. Crawford's letter of February 23, 1855, No. 16, says that there was no risk of a filibustering expedition, and that Concha's preparations seem to have been on an unnecessarily large scale. The "state of siege" in Cuba, declared on February 12, 1855, was raised by a proclamation of May 23, 1855. See Crawford to Clarendon, No. 36, May 24, 1855, in P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/878.

The proclamations of yesterday appear to have produced great enthusiasm among the Spanish inhabitants, a great number of them have been enrolled, amongst them most of the wealthy and Influential, and they are to be embodied forthwith for the defence of the Island. . . .

HOWDEN TO CLARENDON, NO. 91, MARCH 4, 1855[23]

The Government received last night a telegraphick dispatch from Cadiz, stating that a Spanish Man of War had arrived from the Havana bringing accounts of a serious conspiracy which had been discovered and frustrated. The assassination of the Captain General Concha in the theatre was to have been the signal for the conspirators. It appears that the plan was known to, and supported by, a party in the United States, as the American Government had stopped a vessel which was on the point of sailing. At the time of the Spanish Steamer leaving the Havana thirty arrests had been made, and the Spanish Government speak in very laudatory terms of the conduct of that of the United States.

HOWDEN TO CLARENDON, NO. 103, MARCH 10, 1855[24]

I have seen a private letter from a person in a highly respectable position in Cuba to his family, and on subjects of private and material interest which leave no doubt that his utmost intelligence and means of observation have been exercised. He says that although the last attempt at insurrection has been frustrated, there will be another and another till the object is attained, with the probability of a general massacre of the "Godos" or born Spaniards. The letter is in reference to very large sums which now are placed in Cuba at the extraordinarily advantageous interest of 12 per cent and he recommends their being transferred to Spain or elsewhere for the sake of security, and for whatever they may bring. The belief in the Havana is that the Captain General has secret orders, in case of an insurrection appearing successful, to proclaim the general emancipation of the Negroes, and to trust to the troops, and to any chance that turn up from the fearful scenes of blood which would ensue, for the re-establishment of the Spanish rule.

LORD NAPIER (BRITISH MINISTER IN WASHINGTON) TO CLARENDON, NO. 80, MAY 26, 1857[25]

[It is certain that the acquisition of Cuba by the United States] is contemplated with avowed or secret favour in every portion of the Union, and that it is the capital object on which the President has fastened his hopes for popularity now and fame hereafter. Your Lordship will therefore be prepared for the dis-

[23] P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/865.
[24] P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/865.
[25] P.R.O., F.O. 5 America/671.

closure of the design at no distant date, and as it is one by which the interests and sentiments of the English people are alike affected, it is worthy of timely and dispassionate examination.

I submit the following reflections to Your Lordship with the greater hesitation because they point to conclusions at variance with prevailing opinions and my own first impressions; these remarks are consequently offered in a suggestive and not in a confident spirit.

The annexation of Cuba to the United States by pecuniary negotiation may be recommended to Great Britain by several arguments—

[(i) The United States tariff is lower than that of Spain, so British trade would gain.

(ii) Production of sugar, tobacco, and coffee—commodities which are all needed in Britain and which are all rising in price—would increase.

(iii) British shipping would benefit.

(iv) Spain would gain 30 to 40 millions sterling for Cuba. She would be able to pay 4/5 of her foreign debt, and undertake great public works. Spain's new prosperity would increase British commerce.

(v) Cuba is more easily attacked than any part of the United States, which would thus become more conciliatory towards Britain.

(vi) If the United States do not buy Cuba, they may get the Island by war or revolution.

(vii) The Cuban slave trade would be abolished.]

(viii) The transfer of Cuba would allay a feeling of uneasiness and jealousy in reference to Great Britain which is fermenting to a greater extent in the United States than is generally allowed. It is imagined here that England forms part of a European Confederacy formed for the purpose of counteracting the extension of the United States in that quarter. . . .

. . . If Her Majesty's Government, on deliberation, resolve that the Interests of Great Britain are not attached to the preservation of Cuba by Spain, it would be desirable that Your Lordship should authorize me to inform the President that the attitude of Great Britain in this matter is one of perfect neutrality. The claims of Her Majesty's subjects would then secure a more benevolent consideration in the pecuniary settlement, the wishes of Her Majesty's Government would obtain a friendly hearing on other questions, and the triumph of American ambition would be associated with grateful sentiments towards England.[26]

[26] Minute by Lord Clarendon, July 31, 1857: "This has remained so long without an answ. that it is perhaps not worth while to answ. it now and I have told Ld. N. privately that we altogether differed from him."

MINUTE BY PALMERSTON, JUNE 18, 1857, REFERRING TO LORD NAPIER'S DISPATCH, NO. 80[27]

This dispatch is not written with the good sense and judgement which naturally belong to Ld. Napier. It is evidently the detailed Exposition of views arguments and opinions instilled into him by the Govt. and others in the United States. It is a Tissue of Fallacies and Sophistries. It is to place on the narrow ground of Shopkeeping Considerations a Question which involves in its ultimate Issue the Jeopardy of valuable Possessions of the British Crown in the West Indies, and increased Dangers to our Floating Commerce. As to the argument that Concession as to Cuba would secure to England the permanent goodwill and future Forbearance of the United States, this is the worn-out argument used by the mouthpieces of the Americans at each step of Encroachment on their Part. This was to be the result of the Concession made to them by the Ashburton Treaty. This again was the motive urged for the Oregon arrangement. This is now put forward about Cuba and this would be repeated when successive Proofs of our weakness and gullibility shall have encouraged them to demand our North American Provinces. I think Napier should have a Hint to cast one Eye at least to the Eastern Shores of the Atlantic and to remember that he has not become a naturalized Citizen of the Union. Moreover besides British Interests there is good Faith to Spain not to be lost sight of.

PALMERSTON TO CLARENDON, JULY 4, 1857[28]

Napier takes a narrow and limited view of the Results of United States extension, and forgets that we have West Indian Colonies. As to propitiating the Yankees by countenancing their schemes of annexation it would be like propitiating an animal of Prey by giving him one of one's Travelling Companions. It would increase his desire for similar food and spur him on to obtain it.

Napier should keep his opinions to himself and not try to make Popularity Capital by proclaiming them.

There can be little doubt that in the Course of time the Anglo-Saxon Race will spread far South in America, but it is for our Interest that this should not happen until the swarms are prepared to separate from the Parent Hive.

[27] Clarendon Papers.
[28] Clarendon Papers.

Book Reviews

The History of History. Volume I. By James T. Shotwell. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. xii, 407. Illustrations, bibliography. $3.75.)

This volume, the first of a set of two, is a revision of Professor Shotwell's *An Introduction to the History of History* published in 1922. It presents a survey of ancient historiography that closes with the age of the Church Fathers. As the author explains in the preface, he has been heavily indebted in his work of revision to the suggestions of Professor J. W. Swain of the University of Illinois who is extensively quoted throughout the volume.

Part I opens with lucid and suggestive chapters on the nature of history and its interpretation. History, says the author, "is the manifestation of life, and behind each event is some effort of mind and will, while within each circumstance exists some power to stimulate or to obstruct" (p. 15). "Less ambitious than theological, philosophical, or even economic theories, it views itself as part of the very process which it attempts to understand. If it has no ecstatic glimpses of finality, it shares at least to the full the exhilaration of the scientific quest" (p. 35). The antecedents of history in myth, legend, and epic are discussed, after which the author rapidly reviews the evolution of ancient scripts and methods of chronological computation. The sources for the history of the Ancient Near East are then briefly described, with one chapter devoted to Egyptian annals and another to the king lists and inscriptions of Babylonia, Assyria, and Persia.

An analysis of Jewish historical literature comprises the whole of Part II; recent theories in regard to the evolution of the scriptural canon are discussed in scholarly fashion, and the works of Josephus are adequately appraised. Parts III and IV present Greek and Roman historiography. The author properly emphasizes the fact that the rise of criticism in the cities of Ionia created a skeptical attitude toward the works of Homer and Hesiod that was a necessary prelude to the epoch-making achievement of Herodotus. The differences between the Greek and Roman approaches to history are skillfully sketched and serve admirably to introduce the sections on Cato, Fabius Pictor, Livy, Tacitus, and other Roman historians.

The volume closes with a survey of the influence of Christianity on history writing. The ascetic ideal, allegorical interpretation, and chronological manipu-

lation enabled the Church Fathers to evolve what for them was the only true philosophy of history. The result was that "The authority of a revealed religion sanctioned but one scheme of history through the vast and intricate evolution of the antique world. A well-nigh insurmountable obstacle was erected to scientific inquiry—one at least which has taken almost nineteen centuries to surmount" (p. 333).

Professor Shotwell's treatment of the Greek and Roman historians is excellent. He avoids the extravagancies of orthodox appreciation and refrains from the modern tendency to disparage the works of the ancients because they fail to measure up to the standards of current historical writing. As he says of Thucydides, "To see in the author of the *Peloponnesian War* a 'modern of moderns,' facing history as we do, equipped with the understanding of the forces of history such as the historian of today possesses, is to indulge in an anachronism almost as naïve as the failure to appreciate Thucydides because he lacks it" (p. 201)!

In a volume of such broad outlook, questions of proportion inevitably will be raised. In the main, the treatment is well balanced, although some exception might be taken to the relatively lengthy discussion of Jewish historiography. The development of alphabets might well be discussed, and a few paragraphs on the decipherments of the Rosetta Stone and the Behistun Inscription should have been included. In the opinion of the reviewer, the relationships between history and the auxiliary sciences should have been more clearly established.

The book is characterized by the felicity of literary style which historians have learned to anticipate in Professor Shotwell's work. A carefully prepared bibliography is included, although few citations to the most recent works are found in the footnotes. The index is adequate and partially analytical. The format of the volume is on the whole pleasing, although the illustrative equipment is meager.

Louisiana State University CHARLES EDWARD SMITH

The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner. With a List of All His Works. Compiled by Everett E. Edwards. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1938. Pp. xi, 316. Bibliography, frontispiece, appendix. $3.50.)

This volume contains the first four of Turner's historical compositions. The earliest and the longest is his monograph, "The Character and Influence of the Indian Trade in Wisconsin." Originally accepted as a dissertation for the Master of Arts degree in the University of Wisconsin, it was first published in 1889 in the *Proceedings* of the Wisconsin State Historical Society. In the following year it was accepted in a "rewritten and enlarged" form as a doctoral thesis at the Johns Hopkins University and soon appeared in the Johns Hopkins University *Studies in Historical and Political Science.* The records of the University do not

reveal any contemporary evaluation of Turner's monograph other than the fact that it was approved. As one of those whose duty it is to pass upon dissertations in history at that University, I have tried to ascertain, as well as I can, what my opinion of it would be if it were now being submitted. Of course, there are serious obstacles to such a judgment. In the first place, I cannot forget that the author is Frederick Jackson Turner. In the second place, I know nothing about the fur trade in Wisconsin, or elsewhere, so that I cannot estimate fairly the extent of his contribution. And thirdly, the standards of the scholarly profession respecting dissertations have changed. Wisely or unwisely, the tendency now is to require more extended pieces of research than those accepted in 1890. Nevertheless, after making all allowances, my conclusion is that I would not have rated the dissertation highly nor would I have foreseen the future greatness of its author. There are obvious defects in proportion and in organization. There is little or no evidence of the creative imagination or of the power to think profoundly which he was so soon to prove he possessed in abundance. I may have missed these qualities or, if he already had them, the dissertation may have suffered from the self-consciousness and the feeling of restriction that blight so many doctoral dissertations.

The intellectual distinction which one associates with Turner's work was clearly apparent in his second piece of historical writing. It was published in 1891 in the *Wisconsin Journal of Education* as "The Significance of History." Challenged by the initiation of university extension courses, Turner wrote this essay to explain "the utility of historical studies" and the current trends of historical writing. Obviously he had been thinking deeply on these subjects and his conclusions will be valued by students of American historiography.

The extraordinary originality of the man and his fertility in ideas are fully revealed in the third essay which appeared, of all places, in an undergraduate magazine and which is now first reprinted. By then, 1892, he had achieved his great generalization—"This ever retreating frontier of free land is the key to American development." Under the title "Problems in American History," he suggested various applications of that idea to the facts of American history. This short article charted the work of an entire school of historical writers during the following two generations and the end is not yet.

His fourth essay was the famous one on "The Significance of the Frontier in American History." It is reprinted in its original form, but an appendix contains the relatively few changes Turner made in its later versions.

Inevitably one looks to see if these essays explain the origin of Turner's thesis. The introduction by Mr. Fulmer Mood is largely devoted to a consideration of that question. It will be read with interest not only by students of Turner and of historiography but also by a wider group who wish to study the process by which new and fruitful ideas are formulated. To what he has said a further suggestion may be added. No one can read the last three of these

essays without noting the numerous references to evolution and the frequent use of biological analogies. Though the terms are not employed in the dissertation, there are portions of it, too, which are devoted to an account of the influence of environment on human activities. Is it not possible that the science which furnished him with a terminology also supplied him with the idea? Darwinian theories were much debated in America during these very years and Turner's frontier hypothesis may well have been one of the earliest and most successful applications of Darwinism to history.

The Johns Hopkins University W. STULL HOLT

A Handbook of Oklahoma Writers. By Mary Hays Marable and Elaine Boylan. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1939. Pp. xiii, 308. Bibliography. $2.50.)

This volume represents several years of research on the part of two trained librarians, based on the materials which have been gathered from various elusive sources. After a careful perusal of this book, one is convinced of the growth of this new state, Oklahoma, and of a commendable increase in the number of authors who have attained statewide and national recognition as writers. It may be termed a literary "Who's Who of Oklahoma," but not a literary history. In the years to come such a work may be written, at which time it will be necessary to take into account *A Handbook of Oklahoma Writers.* This volume fills a long-felt need. It will prove a valuable source of reference for librarians, students, club members, and others interested in Oklahoma writers. It will also prove a welcome aid to those people who, here and there in the state of Oklahoma, are gathering collections of works dealing with the state.

Biography and bibliography are both included. Oklahoma authors are divided into the following classifications: novelists and short-story writers; poets; dramatists; historians and writers of general nonfiction. There should have been included, it seems to the reviewer, a chapter devoted to biographers. Several well-known Oklahoma authors are listed in other categories who are generally thought of, primarily, as biographers. It is difficult, however, to place some writers in just one classification, and many notable Oklahoma authors could be included in several fields of writing. One omission in the biographical sketches is that of Captain W. S. Nye, the scholarly author of *Carbine and Lance, the Story of Old Fort Sill,* although he is listed in the section devoted to bibliography of writers. The authors of this book should have recast their treatment of some of these sketches, several of which are too laudatory. It is true that Mrs. Marable and Miss Boylan state that some of the material was supplied by the writers themselves. In justice to the authors of this volume it should be stated that a difficult problem was faced in gathering their materials from widely scattered sources. A commendable feature of *A Handbook of Oklahoma Writers* is

the town list of writers. Here, too, there are noticeable omissions. There is also a list of literary awards and distinctions which have been won by Oklahomans. A noteworthy contribution has been made in the "Bibliography of Writers," which is both comprehensive and accurate, although here and there the reviewer detects the omission of certain titles which should have been included.

The authors impress the reader with a commendable familiarity with their subject. It seems unfortunate that they should not have brought their manuscript down to date in several instances. In their "Acknowledgements" they should have been more accurate in checking their statements as to the positions held by some of the people who aided them. However, the authors are to be congratulated upon their thoughtfulness in making available a worthwhile handbook which will prove invaluable in the years to come.

The University of Oklahoma Press is to be commended for the excellent typography and attractive format of this interesting volume.

Oklahoma Historical Society JAMES W. MOFFITT

Jamestown and St. Mary's, Buried Cities of Romance. By Henry Chandlee Forman. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. Pp. xvii, 355. Illustrations, maps. $4.50.)

Mr. Forman presents a uniquely interesting contribution to an understanding of the mode of life in these two focal points of seventeenth century Virginia and Maryland. He has served as chief architect of the Jamestown Archaeological Project for the United States Department of the Interior, and as assistant head of the Historic American Buildings Survey. As would be expected, the book is primarily concerned with architecture, and is based largely on archaeological investigations. Chapters relating to Jamestown are in the nature of a report of the findings of the Archaeological Project as to the size, style, materials, and decorative devices of buildings that stood two and a half centuries and more ago. Mr. Forman has followed up the work there by independent diggings of his own at St. Mary's, which included the foundations of the first Chapel, of Smith's Town House, and of the Secretary's Office or the Old Court House. An attractive feature of the book, adding much to its value, is provided by sixty-eight illustrations. Some are photographic. Many, and among the most interesting, are sketches made by the author. Subjects include tiles, hinges, casements, etc., recovered by excavation, and conjectural drawings of buildings based on a study of foundations and of known architectural patterns of both the old and the new world. Several maps, especially the two that serve as end papers, call for important revisions in heretofore popular conceptions of the plan and growth of the two towns.

Many of the questions raised are of the sort with which no mere historian should meddle. "The places where a colonial government used to meet," to

quote the author, "are revered spots." Regarded with equal reverence, it may be added, are those places where colonial forefathers first set foot on American soil, where they first worshipped, and where they first lived and died. It is natural that these places should become shrines of family, state, and national devotion; that self-appointed priests, and priestesses, should appear to confound the doubter by citation to chapter and verse of both record and tradition; that mistakes should be made and rivalries develop; and that around contending claims strong vested interests should grow. These matters are in themselves fields of specialization. The professional historian, lacking both the necessary time and the inclination to compete, is well advised to stand clear. Perhaps, then, the reviewer will be permitted merely to note that, of the questions of this sort raised, the most important has to do with the site of the original settlement at Jamestown. Mr. Forman places it approximately half a mile below the old church tower that stands within the grounds of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities. His contention is supported by persuasive arguments.

More important is his contribution to an understanding of the people who inhabitated these lost cities. A full portrait is impossible, but he has sketched for us additional lines to stimulate and guide the imagination. Here we glimpse a people whose life was limited by the hard necessities of frontier conditions, and yet a people who never fully surrendered to those conditions, whose love of grace and beauty managed somehow to find expression in the simplest of buildings, whose hopes and plans often exceeded their immediate capacities. Much of the story is summed up in that of the Maryland statehouse of 1676. In conception, it was "one of the half dozen or so really outstanding structures of the seventeenth century, and of the English race, in this country." As built, its roof leaked practically from the time of its completion, its condition after six years was "ruinous," and with another six years its "decayed" state required still further repairs. With 1694 it was abandoned, along with St. Mary's, as the seat of government.

Mr. Forman's archaeological investigations have been supplemented by an apparently full and careful examination of contemporary records. In the use of these he is for the most part, but not always, skillful. For example (p. 154), a bequest in 1636 to "a new church at James Cittie" cannot be taken as evidence that the "new church" was already constructed. A more serious criticism is invited by the attempt to describe an early colonial city without giving adequate attention to the basic economic pattern of the colony. This applies particularly to his discussion of early Jamestown. Through the years under the company there was at all times a definite, although frequently changing, plan of economic development. The plan, location, and growth of the town must obviously have been related to these larger plans. Finally, many will want to take issue with the author's encouragement of further attempts to reconstruct lost colonial

buildings. It is time perhaps to emphasize the fact that the opportunity at Williamsburg was unique. There is no other quite like it, and we have no guarantee that further work of the sort will be done with the same care and success. At best the result is merely a reproduction, and not the genuine article. At less than the best it is merely misdirected energy resulting in misleading impressions. Would not the time and money required be better directed to such projects as the care and preservation of documentary records, or to the compiling of other such useful books as is this one?

New York University WESLEY FRANK CRAVEN

Thomas Clarkson: The Friend of Slaves. By Earl Leslie Griggs. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1938. Pp. 210. Bibliography, illustrations. $3.50.)

This study is a biographical sketch of the British reformer whose name is identified with the abolition of the African slave trade. The author had unusual facilities for a definitive study. He had access to all the Clarkson manuscripts and to unpublished letters of Clarkson's friends and co-workers; he had the generous co-operation of many scholars in England, and the services of research assistants in this country; his project was furthered by university research funds and a grant-in-aid. The mere accumulation of material must have been monumental but the study itself is sketchy and trite.

Doubtless this is partly due to the fact that the author accepts the traditional appraisal of Clarkson as a great man on his own account and a leader in the movement. Clarkson, however, was not a leader; his position was a subordinate one, and his labors, however useful, were concerned with details of the movement. Moreover, he had no distinction either of ability or of charm; in person he was mediocre and unattractive. Indeed, the contrast between Clarkson's dogged mediocrity and the brilliance of his associates, Brougham, Wilberforce, Macaulay, Charles Fox, and the younger Pitt, was remarked by his contemporaries, and was forgotten only when time had left nothing of them all but their reputations.

Among these famous men Clarkson was distinguished by his single-minded devotion to the abolition of the slave trade and his prodigious energy in furthering it by travel and correspondence. Of all the group, Clarkson alone was the exclusive representative of the cause in the public eye, its pioneer pamphleteer and agent. Though his significant service covered only eight years, from 1785 to 1793, when his health broke from overwork, that service had so identified his name with the movement that its final success in 1807 was considered by reformers everywhere as his victory too; and their acclaim made for Clarkson a notable place in history.

Though he lived on until 1846, through the movement to abolish slavery in the West Indies, and the transfer of that agitation to America, Clarkson's later influence was negligible: in his own person he was little more than a symbol of past antislavery achievement, until he died.

Writing as he does to justify his subject's place in history, the author adds little to standard accounts of Clarkson's contribution to the agitation. His two abortive trips to Europe on antislavery missions are well recounted, and his home life in later years is described in some detail; but the eight years of his gigantic labors, during which he traveled more than thirty-five thousand miles for the cause, are all too briefly told. The usefulness even of this summary is lessened by the absence of references to sources, as is the case throughout the book. Inaccuracies, however, are few. The American abolitionist mentioned on pages 151 and 186-87 was not Benjamin, but Henry Brewster Stanton. In the account of the controversy between Clarkson and the sons of Wilberforce, described in Chapter XII, the document most important to the controversy, Clarkson's quaint chart of the abolition movement in his *History . . . of the Abolition of the African Slave Trade,* is not even mentioned.

Ohio Wesleyan University GILBERT H. BARNES

Liberal Kentucky, 1780-1828. By Niels Henry Sonne. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. ix, 287. Bibliography. $3.00.)

In this book the author maintains that the leaders of early Kentucky were freethinkers whose liberalism was derived from their Virginia experience, nourished by the reading of Voltaire, Jefferson, Thomas Paine, and kindred spirits, and expressed by an advocacy of the separation of church and state, of the exclusion of the clergy from politics, and of prohibition of religious tests for political preferment. The bitterest foes of liberalism were the Presbyterian clergy: "The story of Kentucky Presbyterianism is the story of the ruthless destruction of every vestige of independent theological thought which might arise among the clergy, and even among the laity" (p. 18). As an important step in their war on liberalism the Presbyterian clergy attempted to gain control of education which for all practical purposes meant control of Transylvania University. *Liberal Kentucky* is concerned almost entirely with this struggle over the University. The liberals scored their greatest success in 1817 with the election of Horace Holley to the presidency. But the Presbyterians directed against Holley such a fusillade of vituperation as finally to turn the legislature against him and to force his resignation in 1827. The date marks the end of liberalism in Kentucky. It had perished because the people had been converted to orthodoxy by the Baptists and Methodists and would no longer support freethinkers.

Admitting that the author has made the best of his sources, the reviewer finishes the book somewhat skeptical about the reality of the struggle here depicted. The only liberalism essayed in the book is theological, and even in that limited field the discussion is narrowed to the affairs of the University. The treatment is not broad enough to justify the title of the book. It is as if one should attempt to describe the composition of the solar system by observing a soil sample from Harlan County. Much of what Mr. Sonne has pictured as a theological contest might very properly be viewed merely as political. The Presbyterians were Federalists, the liberals were Republicans, and in those days, as well as in later times, political foes were not above hitting each other with theological clubs. That the Kentucky populace was ever freethinking the reviewer doubts, although he has no doubts at all about its immorality. A conversion to orthodoxy certainly occurred but it was a conversion from immorality, not from infidelity. Freethinking had no more popular support in 1780 than in 1830. But may it not be that the real reason the Kentuckians turned to the Presbyterians was not because the Presbyterians represented orthodoxy, but because they represented wealth and respectability?

Florida State College for Women R. S. COTTERILL

Alabama: A Social and Economic History of the State. By Marie Bankhead Owen. (Montgomery, Alabama: Dixie Book Company, Inc., 1938. Pp. xvi, 624. Illustrations, maps, appendix. $3.00.)

At first glance this is just another history of Alabama. Actually it is more than the ordinary history of the state. Its fourteen chapters, comprising biographies of many whose names were connected with Alabama, portray every aspect of the state's development in war and peace, including the native Indians; the explorations of the Spaniards; the coming of the white settlers; transportation; agricultural, commercial, and industrial life; education; religion; literature; and government.

The work is topical rather than chronological. It is comprehensive, instructive, newsy, interesting, and is couched in facile language. In addition to the author's personal familiarity with every phase of her subject, the Department of Archives and History, of which Mrs. Owen is director, supplies rich stores of information on all phases of the commonwealth.

Almost half the book is devoted to a detailed history of Alabama counties. The numerous maps, pictures, and marginal notes add greatly to the value of the text, which obviously was prepared for use in the state's educational system.

Mercer University JOHN B. CLARK

Admitting that the author has made the best of his sources, the reviewer finishes the book somewhat skeptical about the reality of the struggle here depicted. The only liberalism essayed in the book is theological, and even in that limited field the discussion is narrowed to the affairs of the University. The treatment is not broad enough to justify the title of the book. It is as if one should attempt to describe the composition of the solar system by observing a soil sample from Harlan County. Much of what Mr. Sonne has pictured as a theological contest might very properly be viewed merely as political. The Presbyterians were Federalists, the liberals were Republicans, and in those days, as well as in later times, political foes were not above hitting each other with theological clubs. That the Kentucky populace was ever freethinking the reviewer doubts, although he has no doubts at all about its immorality. A conversion to orthodoxy certainly occurred but it was a conversion from immorality, not from infidelity. Freethinking had no more popular support in 1780 than in 1830. But may it not be that the real reason the Kentuckians turned to the Presbyterians was not because the Presbyterians represented orthodoxy, but because they represented wealth and respectability?

Florida State College for Women R. S. COTTERILL

Alabama: A Social and Economic History of the State. By Marie Bankhead Owen. (Montgomery, Alabama: Dixie Book Company, Inc., 1938. Pp. xvi, 624. Illustrations, maps, appendix. $3.00.)

At first glance this is just another history of Alabama. Actually it is more than the ordinary history of the state. Its fourteen chapters, comprising biographies of many whose names were connected with Alabama, portray every aspect of the state's development in war and peace, including the native Indians; the explorations of the Spaniards; the coming of the white settlers; transportation; agricultural, commercial, and industrial life; education; religion; literature; and government.

The work is topical rather than chronological. It is comprehensive, instructive, newsy, interesting, and is couched in facile language. In addition to the author's personal familiarity with every phase of her subject, the Department of Archives and History, of which Mrs. Owen is director, supplies rich stores of information on all phases of the commonwealth.

Almost half the book is devoted to a detailed history of Alabama counties. The numerous maps, pictures, and marginal notes add greatly to the value of the text, which obviously was prepared for use in the state's educational system.

Mercer University JOHN B. CLARK

Internal Improvement in South Carolina, 1817-1828 . . . from the Reports of the Superintendent of Public Works, and from Contemporary Pamphlets, Newspaper Clippings, Letters, Petitions and Maps. Edited by David Kohn and Bess Glenn. (Washington, D. C.: Privately printed, 1938. Pp. xv, A22, 633. Illustrations, maps, charts, index. $40.00.)

South Carolina spent over $2,000,000 for internal improvements between 1818 and 1828. Mr. Kohn has collected and reproduced in this volume reports of the officers in charge of public works. Only the Santee-Cooper Canal had been built in South Carolina before 1817, when the office of Civil and Military Engineer was created. The report of 1818 by John Wilson, engineer, deals with the construction of District Court buildings and goals, obstructions to rivers, canals lateral to the coast, and the need of stock companies to build and maintain better roads. In 1818, $1,000,000 was appropriated to cover expenditures for four years, and the Engineer's report of 1819, the reports of his successors, the Board of Public Works for 1820-1822, and the Superintendent of Public Works for 1923-1928, continue the story. The Board consisted of Joel R. Poinsett, Robert Mills, Nicholas Harbemont, Robert G. Mills, and the Superintendent Abram Blanding who had been Acting Commissioner for the Board. Important to the historian are various recommendations which reveal social and economic conditions. The economist may be interested in accounts itemizing expenditures of construction, while the geographer will find much about the original condition of the state and will be tantalized by references to maps and plans not published, but perhaps still in the state archives.

By 1828 the public building program was completed, canals had been built lateral to the coast and around the falls of the rivers, and a state road from Charleston to Columbia to the Saluda Gap and roads to Camden and Hamburgh were ready for use. With the report of 1828 summarizing this work, there is a brief report on a proposed railroad from Charleston to Hamburgh, for South Carolina had turned to the newest mode of travel, making her recent constructions obsolete.

Mr. Kohn has also included in his book an anonymous pamphlet, *Plans and Progress of Internal Improvement in South Carolina* (1820), and a curious one by Robert Mills, America's first native architect, *Internal Improvements of South Carolina . . .* (1822). The original pamphlets were annotated with illuminating marginal notes and clippings. Other illustrative materials include excerpts of maps from Mills' *Atlas;* a title page, and a title page and excerpts, from other pamphlets by Mills; letters, notes, brief biographies of the various men, and portraits. In addition, Miss Glenn has prepared an index which is invaluable. It includes place names and certain large subjects as "slaves" and "roads," subdivided by place or other subjects.

In reproducing these pamphlets by an offset photographic process, Mr. Kohn has produced a book important not only to the scholar but to those interested

in photographic publications. He eliminates foxing and staining by filters; illegible material is touched with India ink; and the blots which obscure type are painted out with white ink. The result is very satisfactory, and may be compared with ordinary reproduction as illustrated by two letters which he reproduces from other books. The photographic end pages and also the maps reproduced from Robert Mills' *Atlas* are not sharp enough. The scales of the originals are not indicated and the citations are incorrect as in no case did Mills make a map for more than one district. The book was continuously paged for indexing, but unfortunately the original page numbers were removed so that the originals cannot be compared or citations checked. The book is printed on laid paper, and is watermarked "Aurelian" on every sixth page, so that with the printed marginal notes and continuous paging the facsimile can be distinguished from the original.

It might be argued that $40 for the volume is disproportionately large, but the originals are very rare, and it should also be considered that the cheapest photographic prints available to the scholar through the Library of Congress or Bibliofilm Service would cost ten cents a page, or $63 for the volume. So far as can be ascertained Mr. Kohn possesses the only complete set. A portion of the 1825 report and three copies of the Mills pamphlet are in the Library of Congress. The reports of 1818, 1820, and 1825 and two copies of the Mills pamphlet have been located by the American Imprints Inventory, while only one of the Mills items reproduced by title page is listed in the Union Catalogue. In making this material available and indexing it Mr. Kohn and Miss Glenn have performed a true service to scholarship and fine book production.

The National Archives DAVID C. DUNIWAY

The Presidential Election of 1824 in North Carolina. By Albert Ray Newsome. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. vi, 202. Bibliography, maps. $1.25.)

In the presidential election of 1824 North Carolina departed from the customs of previous years. In preceding elections the state's complement of presidential electors had been nominated by caucus of the legislature and elected by the people who had no choice other than to vote for the caucus ticket or stay away from the polls. Realizing their unimportance, less than 5,000 North Carolinians cast ballots in the presidential election of 1820. The electors chosen in this fashion then voted for the presidential nominee of the Congressional caucus. The people, except when they elected legislators and congressmen with a view to their participation in the caucuses, had no power under this system. But the overthrow of the system was within their power; and this they accomplished in 1824.

Crawford, the caucus candidate, was placed before North Carolinians as an advocate of governmental economy and peace and as an opponent of tariff and

in photographic publications. He eliminates foxing and staining by filters; illegible material is touched with India ink; and the blots which obscure type are painted out with white ink. The result is very satisfactory, and may be compared with ordinary reproduction as illustrated by two letters which he reproduces from other books. The photographic end pages and also the maps reproduced from Robert Mills' *Atlas* are not sharp enough. The scales of the originals are not indicated and the citations are incorrect as in no case did Mills make a map for more than one district. The book was continuously paged for indexing, but unfortunately the original page numbers were removed so that the originals cannot be compared or citations checked. The book is printed on laid paper, and is watermarked "Aurelian" on every sixth page, so that with the printed marginal notes and continuous paging the facsimile can be distinguished from the original.

It might be argued that $40 for the volume is disproportionately large, but the originals are very rare, and it should also be considered that the cheapest photographic prints available to the scholar through the Library of Congress or Bibliofilm Service would cost ten cents a page, or $63 for the volume. So far as can be ascertained Mr. Kohn possesses the only complete set. A portion of the 1825 report and three copies of the Mills pamphlet are in the Library of Congress. The reports of 1818, 1820, and 1825 and two copies of the Mills pamphlet have been located by the American Imprints Inventory, while only one of the Mills items reproduced by title page is listed in the Union Catalogue. In making this material available and indexing it Mr. Kohn and Miss Glenn have performed a true service to scholarship and fine book production.

The National Archives DAVID C. DUNIWAY

The Presidential Election of 1824 in North Carolina. By Albert Ray Newsome. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. vi, 202. Bibliography, maps. $1.25.)

In the presidential election of 1824 North Carolina departed from the customs of previous years. In preceding elections the state's complement of presidential electors had been nominated by caucus of the legislature and elected by the people who had no choice other than to vote for the caucus ticket or stay away from the polls. Realizing their unimportance, less than 5,000 North Carolinians cast ballots in the presidential election of 1820. The electors chosen in this fashion then voted for the presidential nominee of the Congressional caucus. The people, except when they elected legislators and congressmen with a view to their participation in the caucuses, had no power under this system. But the overthrow of the system was within their power; and this they accomplished in 1824.

Crawford, the caucus candidate, was placed before North Carolinians as an advocate of governmental economy and peace and as an opponent of tariff and

internal improvements. Inasmuch as state sentiment was divided on these and other national issues, there was some dissatisfaction with his candidacy. Furthermore, since Crawford's friends were the eastern politicians who were in control of the state government, all who disliked the *status quo* in state policies tended to oppose him. Opposition was strongest in the west, and at Salisbury a movement was begun to push the candidacy of Calhoun who was viewed as the champion of nationalism and internal improvements. After an unsuccessful attempt in the state elections of 1823 to fill the legislature with anti-Crawford men, Calhoun's friends formed an anticaucus electoral ticket, using the name People's Ticket with the hope of winning the supporters of Adams and Jackson. Clay had no strength in North Carolina. But when the leaders began to stir up the people in behalf of this ticket, it was soon evident that Jackson rather than Calhoun was the popular favorite. Before election day the People's Ticket, without change of name, had become the Jackson ticket with Calhoun retained in second place. It won more than 20,000 popular votes; the Crawford ticket received about 15,000. Western North Carolina had showed its strength, the popularity of Jackson was proved, the caucus was discredited, and North Carolina had dared to vote contrary to Virginia's behest.

It is not easy in a brief review to indicate the value of this study. It consists chiefly in being an excellent account of a complex and significant episode in North Carolina history. Much information is presented about current methods of political struggle. The fact is well established that although personalities were important forces in the election, issues both state and national played a large part in determining the results. More precision in defining certain geographical terms, such as "sound region," "Quaker counties," and "middle east," would have been helpful. The index is unusually good.

Duke University CHARLES S. SYDNOR

Democracy in the Making: The Jackson-Tyler Era. By Hugh Russell Fraser. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1938. Pp. 334. Illustrations, bibliography. $3.50.)

Interpreting the period as one in which democracy came into its own, Mr. Fraser has written a dramatic story of the years from 1830 to 1844. The author is not concerned with political democracy as manifested in the extension of suffrage, the equalization of representation, and the expanding participation of the people in government. He mentions these things only incidentally. Neither is he concerned with the expanding functions of government. He is primarily interested in the contest between the money power and the national government. The central theme of this gripping story is, therefore, the fight between Andrew Jackson and the Second Bank of the United States. Mr. Fraser adds a new chapter to this story and terminates his account with John Tyler's victory over Henry Clay and the Whigs. Tyler's vetoes of the distribution and Bank bills are

internal improvements. Inasmuch as state sentiment was divided on these and other national issues, there was some dissatisfaction with his candidacy. Furthermore, since Crawford's friends were the eastern politicians who were in control of the state government, all who disliked the *status quo* in state policies tended to oppose him. Opposition was strongest in the west, and at Salisbury a movement was begun to push the candidacy of Calhoun who was viewed as the champion of nationalism and internal improvements. After an unsuccessful attempt in the state elections of 1823 to fill the legislature with anti-Crawford men, Calhoun's friends formed an anticaucus electoral ticket, using the name People's Ticket with the hope of winning the supporters of Adams and Jackson. Clay had no strength in North Carolina. But when the leaders began to stir up the people in behalf of this ticket, it was soon evident that Jackson rather than Calhoun was the popular favorite. Before election day the People's Ticket, without change of name, had become the Jackson ticket with Calhoun retained in second place. It won more than 20,000 popular votes; the Crawford ticket received about 15,000. Western North Carolina had showed its strength, the popularity of Jackson was proved, the caucus was discredited, and North Carolina had dared to vote contrary to Virginia's behest.

It is not easy in a brief review to indicate the value of this study. It consists chiefly in being an excellent account of a complex and significant episode in North Carolina history. Much information is presented about current methods of political struggle. The fact is well established that although personalities were important forces in the election, issues both state and national played a large part in determining the results. More precision in defining certain geographical terms, such as "sound region," "Quaker counties," and "middle east," would have been helpful. The index is unusually good.

Duke University CHARLES S. SYDNOR

Democracy in the Making: The Jackson-Tyler Era. By Hugh Russell Fraser. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1938. Pp. 334. Illustrations, bibliography. $3.50.)

Interpreting the period as one in which democracy came into its own, Mr. Fraser has written a dramatic story of the years from 1830 to 1844. The author is not concerned with political democracy as manifested in the extension of suffrage, the equalization of representation, and the expanding participation of the people in government. He mentions these things only incidentally. Neither is he concerned with the expanding functions of government. He is primarily interested in the contest between the money power and the national government. The central theme of this gripping story is, therefore, the fight between Andrew Jackson and the Second Bank of the United States. Mr. Fraser adds a new chapter to this story and terminates his account with John Tyler's victory over Henry Clay and the Whigs. Tyler's vetoes of the distribution and Bank bills are

regarded as the culmination of the fight begun by Jackson in 1832. Land speculation and the panic of 1837, both of which Mr. Fraser attributes to the evil machinations of the moneyed plutocracy, are treated as parts of the Bank controversy.

Personalities stand out most forcefully in this racy story. Andrew Jackson is of course the chief hero. "For eight long years he had fought monopoly and special privilege. He had sought governmental subsidies for the many, not the few—for the people, not the bankers; for the settlers, not the speculators" (p. 74). Next to Jackson, John Tyler emerges as an able and courageous champion of the people against the corrupt money crowd. The author follows pretty generally the well-traveled road, but his treatment of Tyler is fresh and original. Because Tyler blocked Clay's program of distribution, protection, and the Bank, he was read out of the party by the Whig leaders. Taking his cue from John Quincy Adams, John Minor Botts preferred, in the House of Representatives, "charges of corruption, high crimes and misdemeanors" against Tyler. The House refused to sustain the charges but historians have been prone to accept the view of the Whig leaders and to condemn Tyler for his break with the Whigs. Fraser rescues Tyler from this fate and not only gives him a clean bill of health but adds also a halo of glory for his vigorous championship of the rights of the people. Roger B. Taney is characterized as one of the mightiest foes of special privilege ever to sit on the Supreme Court as chief justice. And Jackson's new appointments to the bench are considered to have brought democracy to the Supreme Court.

Mr. Fraser writes as an intense partisan. Robert J. Walker, a land speculator who sold out to the Bank and accepted retainer fees from the wealthiest planters of Mississippi, is praised as a champion of democracy since he joined forces with Jackson in the Bank fight. On the other hand, George Poindexter is condemned as "the bankrupt Judas" because he opposed Jackson. Journalists and members of Congress who supported the Bank are roundly scored and the sincerity of their motives is always questioned. Even the evils of Jackson's "Pet Banks," clothed with "a power no banking group should have," are attributed not to Jackson's administration but to the sinister influence of the opposition. This partisanship mars an otherwise brilliant interpretation of the Jacksonian period.

University of North Carolina FLETCHER M. GREEN

The Rampaging Frontier: Manners and Humors of Pioneer Days in the South and the Middle West. By Thomas D. Clark. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1939. Pp. 350. Bibliography. $3.00.)

In recent years the dignified brethren of the historical profession have reluctantly admitted that the homely, everyday experiences of men are worth recording. Certainly wit and humor are a part of every people's life, and in even the

regarded as the culmination of the fight begun by Jackson in 1832. Land speculation and the panic of 1837, both of which Mr. Fraser attributes to the evil machinations of the moneyed plutocracy, are treated as parts of the Bank controversy.

Personalities stand out most forcefully in this racy story. Andrew Jackson is of course the chief hero. "For eight long years he had fought monopoly and special privilege. He had sought governmental subsidies for the many, not the few—for the people, not the bankers; for the settlers, not the speculators" (p. 74). Next to Jackson, John Tyler emerges as an able and courageous champion of the people against the corrupt money crowd. The author follows pretty generally the well-traveled road, but his treatment of Tyler is fresh and original. Because Tyler blocked Clay's program of distribution, protection, and the Bank, he was read out of the party by the Whig leaders. Taking his cue from John Quincy Adams, John Minor Botts preferred, in the House of Representatives, "charges of corruption, high crimes and misdemeanors" against Tyler. The House refused to sustain the charges but historians have been prone to accept the view of the Whig leaders and to condemn Tyler for his break with the Whigs. Fraser rescues Tyler from this fate and not only gives him a clean bill of health but adds also a halo of glory for his vigorous championship of the rights of the people. Roger B. Taney is characterized as one of the mightiest foes of special privilege ever to sit on the Supreme Court as chief justice. And Jackson's new appointments to the bench are considered to have brought democracy to the Supreme Court.

Mr. Fraser writes as an intense partisan. Robert J. Walker, a land speculator who sold out to the Bank and accepted retainer fees from the wealthiest planters of Mississippi, is praised as a champion of democracy since he joined forces with Jackson in the Bank fight. On the other hand, George Poindexter is condemned as "the bankrupt Judas" because he opposed Jackson. Journalists and members of Congress who supported the Bank are roundly scored and the sincerity of their motives is always questioned. Even the evils of Jackson's "Pet Banks," clothed with "a power no banking group should have," are attributed not to Jackson's administration but to the sinister influence of the opposition. This partisanship mars an otherwise brilliant interpretation of the Jacksonian period.

University of North Carolina FLETCHER M. GREEN

The Rampaging Frontier: Manners and Humors of Pioneer Days in the South and the Middle West. By Thomas D. Clark. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1939. Pp. 350. Bibliography. $3.00.)

In recent years the dignified brethren of the historical profession have reluctantly admitted that the homely, everyday experiences of men are worth recording. Certainly wit and humor are a part of every people's life, and in even the

most tragic chapters of human history Nature has generally provided some comic relief. Recent books, like Constance Rourke's *American Humor,* Hudson's *Humor of the Old Deep South,* and Blair's *Native American Humor, 1800-1900,* are serious, scholarly contributions, to prove that some of history has been lived "in lighter vein." Professor Clark has now added his *Rampaging Frontier* to this distinguished list, and in scholarship, style, and appreciation for his materials, Clark's book is the equal, and in some respects, the superior of the books with which it is likely to be compared.

The Rampaging Frontier is a bit of impressionism, dealing with the manners and humors of pioneer days in the Middle West. It is concerned with the "earthy elements of humanity." Its locale is the frontier west of the Alleghenies, between the boundaries of Tennessee and the Ohio River, and extending to the Mississippi, with an occasional excursion beyond. The period is the seventy-five years before 1850. Clark gives us an exciting picture of that old frontier, with its brawls and "gougings" and its barbarous gander pullings; its tobacco-spitting pioneers; the "varmints" of the forests; the river men, gamblers, politicians, judges, and preachers; the steamboat traffic, the taverns, the liquor barrels, the political barbecues, the camp meetings, and the pulpit orators who preached a wrathful God; the horse racing and cockfighting; the fiddlers and the "gals"; the greenhorns and the Yankee peddlers; and dozens of other types and incidents associated with an earlier and picturesque America. The author has caught the spirit of it all so well that he seems to write almost as an eyewitness of the scenes he describes.

Some of this material will not please the fastidious, and is not intended for readers with weak stomachs. Perhaps some lines in the picture have been drawn a little too sharply to preserve the exact perspective. But no reader will fail to find the book interesting, and he will long remember many of the tall tales reproduced. Whoever can read the description of the fight with the tiger, or the account of the buckskin patriot who wanted to repeal the common law, or the judge's reference to the man "who would ride a jackass into the Garden of Eden and hitch him to the Tree of Life," without bursting into a loud guffaw, needs to be psychoanalyzed.

The book is entertaining and amusing on almost every page, but this should not blind the reader to the fact that it is a serious piece of historical craftsmanship, and a real contribution to American history and American humor. Its many pages of bibliography and footnotes reflect years of research into all kinds of elusive historical materials. To master the idiom of the frontier, or to learn the intricacies of cards and gambling in order to write the chapter on "Keards," in itself requires long and careful application to a subject which the reviewer assumes was not part of the original intellectual endowment of the author.

Oberlin College CARL WITTKE

Lee, Grant and Sherman: A Study in Leadership in the 1864-65 Campaign. By Lieut.- Colonel Alfred H. Burne. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939. Pp. xxiii, 216. Frontispiece, tables, maps. $3.00.)

In the years since the close of the Civil War, many of the developments then presaged or first devised have been improved and refined by study and use until now the combat army has become a collection of machines manned by humans, rather than a collection of humans using such crude machines as were then available. The muzzle-loading smoothbore has given way to the high-powered automatic rifle; the little-used Gatling gun has been developed into the machine gun; the cumbersome, short-range, cast-iron cannons have been replaced by the long-range, powerful howitzers, mortars, and siege guns; the captive observation balloon is no more but myriads of airplanes have taken over its functions and immensely enlarged them; the slow-moving horse- and mule-drawn munitions and supply trains have been replaced by the swift motor truck or ammunition lorry; the crude, temporary trench system has given way to the elaborate, permanent trench fortification.

In spite of these vast and far-reaching changes in the weapons and methods of warfare, the human element has changed hardly at all; the principles of warfare, likewise, have changed little. The ability effectively to co-ordinate speed, mobility, surprise movement, and fire power are still the essential components of successful military leadership. It is for this reason that a careful study of the strategy, tactics, and leadership of Lee, Grant, and Sherman is useful. Each of these leaders, with varying success, employed these principles. A study of their performance such as here presented is therefore worth-while.

The author's principal interest is in Lee's skillful leadership; Grant is admired primarily for his "tenacity of purpose" in the problem of forcing Lee back to Richmond; Sherman is criticized for his constant pursuit of geographical rather than military objectives, as witness his failure to destroy Hood's army after the fall of Atlanta and his subsequent raids to the sea and thence northward through the Carolinas.

The author also devotes space to the near successes of Early in the Shenandoah Valley and Hood in Tennessee. The two campaigns, seldom considered in critical military studies of the last year of the war, deserve more than passing notice. Though essentially auxiliary operations, final Confederate success in either would have had far-reaching results; as it was they only lacked force and more driving power to achieve their objectives. Early, by "his own boldness, activity, quick wittedness, driving power and willingness to take risks," came so near to success that Grant was forced to make heavy detachments of reenforcements to check him. Sheridan, assigned to dispose of Early, is considered "a failure" as "an independent army commander." With reasonably equal resources in men and materials Early conceivably could have driven Sheridan

across the Potomac and himself taken the offensive. But already the sun of the Confederacy was sinking.

The same handicaps that restricted the extent of Early's success also affected Hood, whom the author considers the "most maligned" of Southern generals, although for what reasons is not apparent. Hood's service under Johnston and his accession to command the Army of Tennessee in Johnston's place reflect little credit on him. The author's discussion of Hood's elevation to the command of the army is both misleading and inaccurate, and betrays a lack of detailed knowledge of the incident (pp. 72, 73, 89, 96). Hood was an energetic and daring leader in the midst of battle, but less successful in directing an army in the field. The author's defense overlooks the basic reasons for much of the criticism that has been directed against Hood, criticism based on his own conduct and leadership. His strategical conceptions were good, but his tactical execution left much to be desired. Stubbornness, pique, and irresolution at critical moments characterized Hood and he was defeated in every battle after he succeeded Johnston.

Though written in a historical vacuum without reference to social, political, and economic conditions, this book is a welcome addition to the military history of the period. There are, however, an inexcusable number of errors in names, dates, spelling, citations, etc. For a book of this character the footnotes would be more helpful if they were more explicit and informing. There is an introductory preface by Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman, a bibliographical note, an index, and more than twenty-five useful maps.

Port Washington, New York THOMAS ROBSON HAY

The Man Who Killed Lincoln. By Philip Van Doren Stern. (New York: Random House, 1939. Pp. vii, 376. Frontispiece. $3.00.)

Here is a book with many marks of excellence in writing, but one so colored for dramatic effect by the flare of the writer's literary brush that it mystifies the reader as to the author's purposes and the value of the book. One sees throughout the narrative a curious mingling of fiction and fact, which the uninformed will not seek to disentangle, but will accept as truth, and whose false impressions will not be corrected easily, if at all.

The author begins with a fantastic story laid on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington. A picture of Booth is presented—his appearance at the particular time, what he thought, what he said to himself, exactly how he twisted his face, and even the remarks of soldiers to Booth or about him as they passed by—all of it written as if it were factual and historical. The same method is used in reporting an alleged conversation between George Atzerodt and a soldier in a barroom (pp. 148-51). Further on there is an apparently authentic description of the imaginings and words of Booth (pp. 184-86), and an alleged conversa-

across the Potomac and himself taken the offensive. But already the sun of the Confederacy was sinking.

The same handicaps that restricted the extent of Early's success also affected Hood, whom the author considers the "most maligned" of Southern generals, although for what reasons is not apparent. Hood's service under Johnston and his accession to command the Army of Tennessee in Johnston's place reflect little credit on him. The author's discussion of Hood's elevation to the command of the army is both misleading and inaccurate, and betrays a lack of detailed knowledge of the incident (pp. 72, 73, 89, 96). Hood was an energetic and daring leader in the midst of battle, but less successful in directing an army in the field. The author's defense overlooks the basic reasons for much of the criticism that has been directed against Hood, criticism based on his own conduct and leadership. His strategical conceptions were good, but his tactical execution left much to be desired. Stubbornness, pique, and irresolution at critical moments characterized Hood and he was defeated in every battle after he succeeded Johnston.

Though written in a historical vacuum without reference to social, political, and economic conditions, this book is a welcome addition to the military history of the period. There are, however, an inexcusable number of errors in names, dates, spelling, citations, etc. For a book of this character the footnotes would be more helpful if they were more explicit and informing. There is an introductory preface by Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman, a bibliographical note, an index, and more than twenty-five useful maps.

Port Washington, New York THOMAS ROBSON HAY

The Man Who Killed Lincoln. By Philip Van Doren Stern. (New York: Random House, 1939. Pp. vii, 376. Frontispiece. $3.00.)

Here is a book with many marks of excellence in writing, but one so colored for dramatic effect by the flare of the writer's literary brush that it mystifies the reader as to the author's purposes and the value of the book. One sees throughout the narrative a curious mingling of fiction and fact, which the uninformed will not seek to disentangle, but will accept as truth, and whose false impressions will not be corrected easily, if at all.

The author begins with a fantastic story laid on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington. A picture of Booth is presented—his appearance at the particular time, what he thought, what he said to himself, exactly how he twisted his face, and even the remarks of soldiers to Booth or about him as they passed by—all of it written as if it were factual and historical. The same method is used in reporting an alleged conversation between George Atzerodt and a soldier in a barroom (pp. 148-51). Further on there is an apparently authentic description of the imaginings and words of Booth (pp. 184-86), and an alleged conversa-

tion of Samuel Cox and Booth is set down (pp. 203-13). Again, there is much detail of events and words spoken in the barn where the assassin met his fate, all written as if it is a factual presentation.

The defective character of this book is not remedied by the "Pamphlet to accompany The Man Who Killed Lincoln," with the title "Afterword," which had better have been called "Afterthought," hidden away in a pocket in the back cover of the book. In this the author discusses sources of material and possible future revelations. Here readers are told that history has provided the stage, with tragic pattern, plot, characters, and setting, all freely given. The author then adds naïvely: "There was no need to invent anything in the telling of the story, other than conversation, internal and external, and that with the few minor exceptions listed below is all that I have invented."

How can the casual reader know what the author invented and what he based on the many reliable sources he consulted in his several years of research? One wonders why readers were not forewarned or informed in an "Introduction" rather than told about the character of the book and its purposes in a detached "Afterword."

As a study of Booth, and as a historical treatise, the reviewer thinks the work is an unfortunate one, for too many will take it for what it certainly is not —an accurate, realistic picture of Booth in those tragic days around Lincoln's assassination. There is a place for historical romance candidly written as romance, but there is no place for romantic history and drama presented as history.

State College, Santa Barbara, California WILLIAM H. ELLISON

Invisible Empire: The Story of the Ku Klux Klan, 1866-1871. By Stanley F. Horn. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1939. Pp. x, 434. Illustrations, appendix. $3.50.)

In many respects the same nocturnal mystery that shrouded the Ku Klux Klan in the beginning, hiding its secrets from the public, inquisitive journalists, paid spies, and Congressional committees, lingers on, making the way hard for those who like to delve into the secrets of the past. As a story of the Klan, rather than as a definitive history, the book under review has much to commend it. Beginning with a rather unusual pictorial history which illustrates the Klan from the beginning to the end, the author then discusses its origin and growth, the methods of operation, and gives separate chapters on the different "Realms," or states, included in the Invisible Empire. Because the conditions giving rise to the Klan were a part of Reconstruction, the author gives a rather dark picture of that era. Despite the extensive testimony found in the thirteen-volume Congressional report and the testimony given at the Ku Klux trials, the author has not succeeded in finding when the Klan started or came to an end in all of the Southern states. The leaders in large part remain unknown, and it seems entirely unsafe to generalize on the character of the membership of the

tion of Samuel Cox and Booth is set down (pp. 203-13). Again, there is much detail of events and words spoken in the barn where the assassin met his fate, all written as if it is a factual presentation.

The defective character of this book is not remedied by the "Pamphlet to accompany The Man Who Killed Lincoln," with the title "Afterword," which had better have been called "Afterthought," hidden away in a pocket in the back cover of the book. In this the author discusses sources of material and possible future revelations. Here readers are told that history has provided the stage, with tragic pattern, plot, characters, and setting, all freely given. The author then adds naïvely: "There was no need to invent anything in the telling of the story, other than conversation, internal and external, and that with the few minor exceptions listed below is all that I have invented."

How can the casual reader know what the author invented and what he based on the many reliable sources he consulted in his several years of research? One wonders why readers were not forewarned or informed in an "Introduction" rather than told about the character of the book and its purposes in a detached "Afterword."

As a study of Booth, and as a historical treatise, the reviewer thinks the work is an unfortunate one, for too many will take it for what it certainly is not —an accurate, realistic picture of Booth in those tragic days around Lincoln's assassination. There is a place for historical romance candidly written as romance, but there is no place for romantic history and drama presented as history.

State College, Santa Barbara, California WILLIAM H. ELLISON

Invisible Empire: The Story of the Ku Klux Klan, 1866-1871. By Stanley F. Horn. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1939. Pp. x, 434. Illustrations, appendix. $3.50.)

In many respects the same nocturnal mystery that shrouded the Ku Klux Klan in the beginning, hiding its secrets from the public, inquisitive journalists, paid spies, and Congressional committees, lingers on, making the way hard for those who like to delve into the secrets of the past. As a story of the Klan, rather than as a definitive history, the book under review has much to commend it. Beginning with a rather unusual pictorial history which illustrates the Klan from the beginning to the end, the author then discusses its origin and growth, the methods of operation, and gives separate chapters on the different "Realms," or states, included in the Invisible Empire. Because the conditions giving rise to the Klan were a part of Reconstruction, the author gives a rather dark picture of that era. Despite the extensive testimony found in the thirteen-volume Congressional report and the testimony given at the Ku Klux trials, the author has not succeeded in finding when the Klan started or came to an end in all of the Southern states. The leaders in large part remain unknown, and it seems entirely unsafe to generalize on the character of the membership of the

local Dens, or on the number of members in any locality. Generally the strength of the organization was in proportion to the evils of the reconstruction in that vicinity. But in Virginia there was no Klan, and in Louisiana and Texas other organizations, such as the Knights of the White Camelia and the Confederate Vigilantes, engaged in somewhat the same activities as the Klan elsewhere, and were frequently confused with it. In all states where the Klan flourished it did so sporadically; in many counties it did not appear at all. Mr. Horn usually attributes the Klan's appearance to the fact that the region concerned was adjacent to the home state of the organization, as in North Alabama, or to a visit by the reputed Grand Wizard, General Forrest.

The necessarily nebulous character of the Klan made it difficult to control, and it was inevitable that it should be perverted by unworthy members, or, as sometimes happened, used by nonmembers and even Negroes in ways which could only further discredit the organization. This situation, together with the opposition from the Radical state governments and the Federal government, and the gradual re-establishment of white supremacy in the South, led to the supposed disbandment of the Klan in 1869; but it was after this date that the association reached its most active stage. It was late in 1871, for example, that Grant established martial law in nine counties of South Carolina because of Klan disturbances. Five chapters are devoted to the decline of the Empire. There is a useful appendix.

While the reviewer is disposed to sympathize with the author in his efforts to trace the elusive Klan, he cannot accept the implication that this is the "complete story." In dealing with a subject that requires the most careful weighing of the evidence, the author is less than critical, and the bibliography is wholly inadequate. There is a pro-Southern and pro-Klan bias which leads to such overstatements as that "Bands of [Union] League members, armed to the teeth, prowled the country at all times." He says that General George W. Gordon wrote the *Prescript* or original constitution of the Klan, but he offers no proof. James W. Patton's *Unionism and Reconstruction in Tennessee* (not in Mr. Horn's bibliography) makes a contrary statement. The author assumes that John B. Gordon was the leader of the Klan in Georgia, and again there is no proof. He is satisfied by the evidence that Nathan Bedford Forrest was the Grand Wizard of the Klan and the moving force behind it. But John A. Wyeth, Forrest's "foremost biographer," did not even consider him a member, and the *Dictionary of American Biography* says of Forrest: "He was involved in the early activities of the Ku Klux Klan, but his connection with the order does not seem to have lasted long." A few minor errors were observed: The name is Mike Strohmeir, not Stroheimer; Robert K. Scott, not Richard K., and Simons, not Simmons. The election referred to on page 215 was held in 1868, not 1867. Luke E. Wright was not secretary of war in Taft's cabinet.

Forty-one years ago the late John Spencer Bassett, contemplating wider fields

for his talents, asked his mentor, Herbert Baxter Adams, how he thought "a clear and comprehensive study of the Ku Klux would strike the public." It is hard to say how it would strike the public, but the serious student of the South would welcome it, despite Mr. Horn's readable narrative.

Duke University R. H. WOODY

Negro Education in Alabama: A Study in Cotton and Steel. By Horace Mann Bond. (Washington: The Associated Publishers, Inc., 1939. Pp. xii, 358. Illustrations, bibliography. $3.25.)

The subtitle correctly informs the reader that this study, aided by a Julius Rosenwald fund grant, is sustained by a socio-economic thesis. It is really an interpretation of the roots and bases of the history and present status of Negro education in Alabama. Continuity is necessarily sacrificed a bit in works of this type, but four general divisions are clearly delimited. The first eight chapters, or about one third of the text, deal with slavery and Reconstruction up to 1875 when control passed permanently over to the conservative Democrats. Chapters nine through eleven develop the changing economic structure, 1860-1901, and its effect. The next two dramatize and interpret the result of the constitutional convention of 1901, and the remaining five explain the economic reasons for the progress to date, aided by philanthropy and unusual personalities.

Throughout the work the author, a professor of education at Fisk University, emphasized basic geographic factors, made clear by outline maps used cleverly as a recurring background for economic and educational statistics. He explains the transition to share-cropping and the control by merchants and money markets, and details the part played by rival capitalistic groups in the railroad era, the rise of industrialism and consequent decline of the Black Belt.

To read any work on Southern history since the Civil War which pretends to be more than a chronicle, with the canons of scientific history in mind, is futile and absurd. We are still a part of the process and our histories are also documents. The author shows skill in the use of prejudices as "documentary evidences to a state of mind" (p. 24). The same test could be applied to his criticism of Fleming. The first few chapters consequently assume a negative flavor, though he notes that educational and political reformers "advanced policies in the South with reference to the Negro far ahead of contemporary northern practice." His close synthesis of all factors strengthens his criticisms of some conclusions, but fails to impair the great value of Fleming's work as a whole. Stimulating ideas are bred, such as the suggestion to study the effect of the panic of 1873 on Reconstruction. His study of the struggle between the railroad interests is important but needs further documentation to fortify the conclusion that another faction of the new Northern industrialism came to terms with the archaic planting aristocracy, causing the Republican party to collapse (p. 72).

for his talents, asked his mentor, Herbert Baxter Adams, how he thought "a clear and comprehensive study of the Ku Klux would strike the public." It is hard to say how it would strike the public, but the serious student of the South would welcome it, despite Mr. Horn's readable narrative.

Duke University R. H. WOODY

Negro Education in Alabama: A Study in Cotton and Steel. By Horace Mann Bond. (Washington: The Associated Publishers, Inc., 1939. Pp. xii, 358. Illustrations, bibliography. $3.25.)

The subtitle correctly informs the reader that this study, aided by a Julius Rosenwald fund grant, is sustained by a socio-economic thesis. It is really an interpretation of the roots and bases of the history and present status of Negro education in Alabama. Continuity is necessarily sacrificed a bit in works of this type, but four general divisions are clearly delimited. The first eight chapters, or about one third of the text, deal with slavery and Reconstruction up to 1875 when control passed permanently over to the conservative Democrats. Chapters nine through eleven develop the changing economic structure, 1860-1901, and its effect. The next two dramatize and interpret the result of the constitutional convention of 1901, and the remaining five explain the economic reasons for the progress to date, aided by philanthropy and unusual personalities.

Throughout the work the author, a professor of education at Fisk University, emphasized basic geographic factors, made clear by outline maps used cleverly as a recurring background for economic and educational statistics. He explains the transition to share-cropping and the control by merchants and money markets, and details the part played by rival capitalistic groups in the railroad era, the rise of industrialism and consequent decline of the Black Belt.

To read any work on Southern history since the Civil War which pretends to be more than a chronicle, with the canons of scientific history in mind, is futile and absurd. We are still a part of the process and our histories are also documents. The author shows skill in the use of prejudices as "documentary evidences to a state of mind" (p. 24). The same test could be applied to his criticism of Fleming. The first few chapters consequently assume a negative flavor, though he notes that educational and political reformers "advanced policies in the South with reference to the Negro far ahead of contemporary northern practice." His close synthesis of all factors strengthens his criticisms of some conclusions, but fails to impair the great value of Fleming's work as a whole. Stimulating ideas are bred, such as the suggestion to study the effect of the panic of 1873 on Reconstruction. His study of the struggle between the railroad interests is important but needs further documentation to fortify the conclusion that another faction of the new Northern industrialism came to terms with the archaic planting aristocracy, causing the Republican party to collapse (p. 72).

Dr. Bond proves the detrimental effect of share-cropping on Negro education; intelligence in business matters and that system do not go together. He also explains how a higher type of education is necessary in an industrial order. The influence of industrialism, migration from the Black Belt, and philanthropy, he concludes, are responsible for the greatly improved conditions since 1910. Historians will probably be most interested in his close analysis of conditions in the Black Belt showing methods of white domination, the Negro's loss of power, and subsequent decline of the area in politics. The study of the use and effects of taxation in maintaining control are illuminating. The work is primarily concerned with public education, but the linkage and influence of the Slater, Jeannes, Rosenwald, and other funds are clearly shown.

No doubt criticism could be made of the discussion of the Populists. Economic determinism is the prevailing note, but it sometimes leads to a slight confusion. The coverage of all types of source material is most unusual. Historians will discover omissions of certain recent works in the bibliography, but the inclusion of others of unusual interest. The notes are inconveniently grouped at the end, unnecessary in a nonpopular work. The author should write another work on the subject matter of Negro education and its effect on the race.

Hayes Memorial Library CURTIS W. GARRISON

Personal Recollections of Trinity College, North Carolina, 1887-1894. By John Franklin Crowell. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1939. Pp. xiv, 280. Illustrations. $3.00.)

It is a far cry from struggling, almost moribund, Trinity College in rural Randolph County, North Carolina, in 1887 to its offspring, spacious Duke University in 1939. The story is interesting and the beginning of the transformation is here told by the man who more than any other is responsible. It is an important part of the history of education in the South.

A few months ago Duke University celebrated the centenary of Union Institute out of which Trinity College grew. The driving force behind the struggling college from the time it was adopted by the North Carolina Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South in 1856, was a self-taught genius, Braxton Craven. With the exception of a few years in the pastorate, he was president until his death in 1882, and can almost be said to have been the college. All had not been clear sailing, however. Funds were scanty and some of the ecclesiastical politicians did not like Dr. Craven. Much of the state at that time was included in other conferences which had institutions of their own.

As so often happens in a one-man institution, there was difficulty in finding a successor upon whom the factions could unite, and the institution seemed about to disintegrate. Three trustees agreed to supplement the small college income so that the six devoted professors could live with the aid of the food they could

Dr. Bond proves the detrimental effect of share-cropping on Negro education; intelligence in business matters and that system do not go together. He also explains how a higher type of education is necessary in an industrial order. The influence of industrialism, migration from the Black Belt, and philanthropy, he concludes, are responsible for the greatly improved conditions since 1910. Historians will probably be most interested in his close analysis of conditions in the Black Belt showing methods of white domination, the Negro's loss of power, and subsequent decline of the area in politics. The study of the use and effects of taxation in maintaining control are illuminating. The work is primarily concerned with public education, but the linkage and influence of the Slater, Jeannes, Rosenwald, and other funds are clearly shown.

No doubt criticism could be made of the discussion of the Populists. Economic determinism is the prevailing note, but it sometimes leads to a slight confusion. The coverage of all types of source material is most unusual. Historians will discover omissions of certain recent works in the bibliography, but the inclusion of others of unusual interest. The notes are inconveniently grouped at the end, unnecessary in a nonpopular work. The author should write another work on the subject matter of Negro education and its effect on the race.

Hayes Memorial Library CURTIS W. GARRISON

Personal Recollections of Trinity College, North Carolina, 1887-1894. By John Franklin Crowell. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1939. Pp. xiv, 280. Illustrations. $3.00.)

It is a far cry from struggling, almost moribund, Trinity College in rural Randolph County, North Carolina, in 1887 to its offspring, spacious Duke University in 1939. The story is interesting and the beginning of the transformation is here told by the man who more than any other is responsible. It is an important part of the history of education in the South.

A few months ago Duke University celebrated the centenary of Union Institute out of which Trinity College grew. The driving force behind the struggling college from the time it was adopted by the North Carolina Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South in 1856, was a self-taught genius, Braxton Craven. With the exception of a few years in the pastorate, he was president until his death in 1882, and can almost be said to have been the college. All had not been clear sailing, however. Funds were scanty and some of the ecclesiastical politicians did not like Dr. Craven. Much of the state at that time was included in other conferences which had institutions of their own.

As so often happens in a one-man institution, there was difficulty in finding a successor upon whom the factions could unite, and the institution seemed about to disintegrate. Three trustees agreed to supplement the small college income so that the six devoted professors could live with the aid of the food they could

raise in their gardens and other pieces of land they cultivated. Meanwhile the trustees sought for a president with discouraging results. The college was small and poor, most Methodists were poor, the state was poor and thought it was poorer than it really was.

The answer was to come from an unexpected quarter. Two students in the Yale Divinity School became friends, and often talked of education and particularly of education in the South. One, John Franklin Crowell, a Pennsylvanian by birth and a graduate of Yale, was also interested in economics and sociology. The other, H. H. Williams, a graduate of the University of North Carolina, and later professor of philosophy in his alma mater, had taught Greek at Trinity for a year. He decided that Crowell might be the man, and when in North Carolina communicated his idea to the committee of the trustees.

After considerable correspondence the young man of twenty-nine, then principal of an academy in Pennsylvania, was chosen president and took office in 1887. His energy was boundless, and he began to stimulate both faculty and students. He taught courses in the social sciences, the first in the state, and encouraged students to look at the world outside. The revolutionary idea that a college should be a vital part of a commonwealth, and that the faculty inside the classroom or out should have the right to discuss any public question was advanced. The curriculum was revised, new members were added to the faculty, and intercollegiate football was introduced. All of these innovations caused some stir.

The young man was something of a visionary—though he thought he always had his feet upon the ground—and began to plan an institution almost as extensive as the modern Duke, thirty-five years before the Duke Foundation. In addition a group of preparatory schools and another of junior colleges were to be affiliated. Apparently he never realized the immense cost, and had no clear idea of the source of the necessary funds. He carried the students with him, but dissensions in the faculty arose. Perhaps the young president was not so tactful as he might have been.

With these plans came the necessity of removing the college from its rural environment to a larger town. This idea created a storm. The residents of the village, several of the faculty, many of the Methodist ministers, some of the trustees, and perhaps a majority of the alumni were opposed at first. After much discussion removal was voted provided that equal or greater facilities be offered by some one of the larger towns, then just beginning to grow into cities. Though the way had been prepared for him, he was largely responsible for the offer by General Julian S. Carr of a site in Durham, and of $85,000 in cash by Washington Duke. The offers were accepted and building was soon begun. President Crowell himself gave the building for the future School of Technology.

Misfortunes followed. The tower of the almost finished main building collapsed, delaying removal for a year; costs outran estimates; some of the build-

ings were badly planned and there was considerable discomfort. Expenses had increased and income had not increased proportionately. Salaries could not be paid promptly though the President poured his personal funds into the treasury. The Duke family was not yet ready to make further considerable contributions.

Dissension in the faculty grew stronger, and there was covert opposition among the trustees. Finally, in 1893, The Western North Carolina Conference, joint owner of the institution, condemned intercollegiate athletics, although President Crowell had indicated that he would look upon such action as a lack of confidence in his administration. The Conference had always been lukewarm toward Trinity, and the athletic question was possibly only an excuse. The reviewer, however, was living in North Carolina then, and well remembers how excited many Methodists became over the question. The action of the Conference, together with other disappointments led President Crowell to offer his resignation in May, 1894, although the trustees unanimously asked him to remain. He refused and left the state after seven years of arduous toil.

Most of these things are set forth in the book. While there is little specific criticism of others, apparently he never blamed himself for any of his difficulties. It is probably true that greater tact in dealing with the older members of the faculty and trustees would have prevented some of the ill-feeling. Other honest men were unable to follow his ideas and believed that the institution would be wrecked by plans which seemed hopelessly extravagant.

Nothing can take from him the honor of being the pioneer in the rebirth of higher education in North Carolina. The present generation, seeing two nationally recognized universities and several strong colleges in the state, can with difficulty visualize the state of higher education in 1887 when the institutions lacked equipment, libraries, funds, students, and the consciousness of their possibilities. He remade Trinity, and stimulated every other institution in the state.

The College of the City of New York HOLLAND THOMPSON

Child Labor Legislation in the Southern Textile States. By Elizabeth H. Davidson. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. x, 302. Map, tables, bibliography. $4.00.)

This is a work of permanent value, done with model competence and thoroughness. Represented modestly as a history of child labor legislation from the eighties to the present, chiefly in Alabama, Georgia, and the Carolinas, the book becomes a study of the social consciousness of a region in the throes of industrial revolution.

Much of Miss Davidson's success is due to the pains she has taken, while unearthing hundreds of bills, resolutions, committee reports, to preserve along with each specimen its taproot and tendrils of folkways, mores, and taboos. She then displays them in their native soil of sectional peculiarities, against a back-

ings were badly planned and there was considerable discomfort. Expenses had increased and income had not increased proportionately. Salaries could not be paid promptly though the President poured his personal funds into the treasury. The Duke family was not yet ready to make further considerable contributions.

Dissension in the faculty grew stronger, and there was covert opposition among the trustees. Finally, in 1893, The Western North Carolina Conference, joint owner of the institution, condemned intercollegiate athletics, although President Crowell had indicated that he would look upon such action as a lack of confidence in his administration. The Conference had always been lukewarm toward Trinity, and the athletic question was possibly only an excuse. The reviewer, however, was living in North Carolina then, and well remembers how excited many Methodists became over the question. The action of the Conference, together with other disappointments led President Crowell to offer his resignation in May, 1894, although the trustees unanimously asked him to remain. He refused and left the state after seven years of arduous toil.

Most of these things are set forth in the book. While there is little specific criticism of others, apparently he never blamed himself for any of his difficulties. It is probably true that greater tact in dealing with the older members of the faculty and trustees would have prevented some of the ill-feeling. Other honest men were unable to follow his ideas and believed that the institution would be wrecked by plans which seemed hopelessly extravagant.

Nothing can take from him the honor of being the pioneer in the rebirth of higher education in North Carolina. The present generation, seeing two nationally recognized universities and several strong colleges in the state, can with difficulty visualize the state of higher education in 1887 when the institutions lacked equipment, libraries, funds, students, and the consciousness of their possibilities. He remade Trinity, and stimulated every other institution in the state.

The College of the City of New York HOLLAND THOMPSON

Child Labor Legislation in the Southern Textile States. By Elizabeth H. Davidson. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. x, 302. Map, tables, bibliography. $4.00.)

This is a work of permanent value, done with model competence and thoroughness. Represented modestly as a history of child labor legislation from the eighties to the present, chiefly in Alabama, Georgia, and the Carolinas, the book becomes a study of the social consciousness of a region in the throes of industrial revolution.

Much of Miss Davidson's success is due to the pains she has taken, while unearthing hundreds of bills, resolutions, committee reports, to preserve along with each specimen its taproot and tendrils of folkways, mores, and taboos. She then displays them in their native soil of sectional peculiarities, against a back-

ground of historical heritage, class conflict, and race difference. Important in her study are factors too often ignored in the ordinary chronicle of legislative history. They include the powerful heritage of paternalism left by plantation slavery, the persistence of the code of family mores and parental authority of feudal strictness, a buccaneer individualism run amuck in the machine age, a sectional defense reflex automatically called into play by any outside criticism.

The central theme of the study is the gradual relaxation of the grip of the laissez-faire creed upon the Southern mind. Anyone who studies this period of Southern history will be impressed by the desperation with which the South grasped at industrialization (especially in textiles) as a panacea. In the depths of their poverty, Southerners fixed upon the cotton mill as a symbol of salvation, and it became almost an emotional necessity among all classes to believe in the panacea. Any threat against it was heresy. This attitude was complicated by the battle for textile supremacy begun against New England about 1880 and won by 1910. Social legislation was easily made to appear another "Yankee trick" to undermine "Southern progress." Baffled by conflicting argument voters listened respectfully to the industrialists, men convinced that they were "the best people of the state—the people who had solved the Negro problem, and who could handle the labor problem as well." Ignorance and poverty and greed contributed to the reformer's problem complications not without their ironies. In one petition of millworkers against a ten-hour-day bill, 154 signers had to make their marks. One industrialist famous for his educational endowments, proclaimed that "The most beautiful sight we see is the child at labor; as early as he may get at labor the more beautiful." The paternalistic industrialist was likely to represent his mill "as an orphan asylum, a children's training school, a playground."

Other readers may share with the reviewer a disappointment in finding scant reference to actual conditions of child labor to accompany the story of legislative reform. A few errors of fact were inevitable: Hoke Smith can hardly be called "an ardent silver Democrat" (p. 85), and Ellison A. Smyth, the South Carolina industrialist, is confused with Ellison D. Smith, the cotton Senator (*passim*). This reviewer, however, only wishes that the same competent hands may continue the history of Southern social legislation admirably launched in this book.

University of Florida C. VANN WOODWARD

Carter Glass: Unreconstructed Rebel. By James E. Palmer. (Roanoke, Virginia: The Institute of American Biography, 1938. Pp. 320. Illustrations, bibliography. $3.25.)

The career of a man like Carter Glass is seldom if ever equaled in American history, and many will be the biographies and studies connected with his life. This first published biography presents an interesting account of the small-town

ground of historical heritage, class conflict, and race difference. Important in her study are factors too often ignored in the ordinary chronicle of legislative history. They include the powerful heritage of paternalism left by plantation slavery, the persistence of the code of family mores and parental authority of feudal strictness, a buccaneer individualism run amuck in the machine age, a sectional defense reflex automatically called into play by any outside criticism.

The central theme of the study is the gradual relaxation of the grip of the laissez-faire creed upon the Southern mind. Anyone who studies this period of Southern history will be impressed by the desperation with which the South grasped at industrialization (especially in textiles) as a panacea. In the depths of their poverty, Southerners fixed upon the cotton mill as a symbol of salvation, and it became almost an emotional necessity among all classes to believe in the panacea. Any threat against it was heresy. This attitude was complicated by the battle for textile supremacy begun against New England about 1880 and won by 1910. Social legislation was easily made to appear another "Yankee trick" to undermine "Southern progress." Baffled by conflicting argument voters listened respectfully to the industrialists, men convinced that they were "the best people of the state—the people who had solved the Negro problem, and who could handle the labor problem as well." Ignorance and poverty and greed contributed to the reformer's problem complications not without their ironies. In one petition of millworkers against a ten-hour-day bill, 154 signers had to make their marks. One industrialist famous for his educational endowments, proclaimed that "The most beautiful sight we see is the child at labor; as early as he may get at labor the more beautiful." The paternalistic industrialist was likely to represent his mill "as an orphan asylum, a children's training school, a playground."

Other readers may share with the reviewer a disappointment in finding scant reference to actual conditions of child labor to accompany the story of legislative reform. A few errors of fact were inevitable: Hoke Smith can hardly be called "an ardent silver Democrat" (p. 85), and Ellison A. Smyth, the South Carolina industrialist, is confused with Ellison D. Smith, the cotton Senator (*passim*). This reviewer, however, only wishes that the same competent hands may continue the history of Southern social legislation admirably launched in this book.

University of Florida C. VANN WOODWARD

Carter Glass: Unreconstructed Rebel. By James E. Palmer. (Roanoke, Virginia: The Institute of American Biography, 1938. Pp. 320. Illustrations, bibliography. $3.25.)

The career of a man like Carter Glass is seldom if ever equaled in American history, and many will be the biographies and studies connected with his life. This first published biography presents an interesting account of the small-town

editor with no practical banking experience, who as congressman became such a master of banking and finance that he was able to tell recalcitrant Wall Street and Main Street bankers what was wrong and what was needed. In the House he effectively met criticism aimed at the projected Federal Reserve system by more experienced men, and he lived long enough to see that system so firmly established that business men and financial leaders came to look upon him as their guardian, the "Dean of Finance." In that long career as editor, congressman, secretary of the treasury, and senator he built a reputation for integrity, pungency, frankness, and courage that aroused the envy and admiration of enemies as well as friends. His criticism of the New Deal is not the only act of rebellion or criticism within his own party. For years he criticized the methods and political principles of the Martin Democratic machine in Virginia and at one time openly challenged and nearly defeated it. He was appointed to the Senate by one of the chief opponents of that machine.

The present volume has both weak and strong points. Details of the early career of Glass would reveal more similarity between his fight for the Federal Reserve and the campaign he carried on against those allied with "sound money" in the 1890's than is shown in the statement that Glass favored free silver because he did not know anything about currency at the time. His remedy might have been wrong, but his editorial analysis of the national situation was surprisingly accurate in view of subsequent developments. The author says the New Deal is Hamiltonian and Glass's criticism thereof is Jeffersonian. His positiveness on this point weakens the book, for certainly many thorough students of Jefferson seriously disagree and say that such an interpretation results from confusion of Jefferson's principles with the tools or means by which he would realize those principles. No attempt is made to conceal the fact that the preparation of the book was a labor of love and admiration. One might reasonably question the point of view that proclaims "Carter Glass . . . consistently right through all these tumultuous years" (p. 258). Also it is surprising to read the statement, unsupported by evidence, that Glass would probably have received the Democratic nomination in 1920 or 1924 had it not been for his distaste for the game of politics as ordinarily played and his consideration for his friend, William G. McAdoo (pp. 148, 167). The chapter on the Federal Reserve is clear, concise, and well written, while that in defense of Wilson needs reworking and revision in the interest of coherence.

In preparing the work the author made use of Glass's speeches, many conversations with the Senator and others, and to some extent private papers. Some bad factual errors are apparent, although many of them are errors in printing which should have been removed in the proofreading. The president of William and Mary was not William C. Brown (p. 295).

The style is not sprightly nor the method scholarly, but as a whole the author has done a valuable piece of pioneer work in the life of a most important man.

Washington and Lee University ALLEN W. MOGER

George W. Truett: A Biography. By Powhatan W. James. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939. Pp. xv, 281. Illustrations, $2.50.)

"Each page of this work by the gifted pastor of the First Baptist Church, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, produces tears of joy and gratitude on the cheek of every loyal Southern Baptist," runs a comment on this "authorized" biography of a really great clergyman. But such emotional expressions revolving about an emotional book make a serene and sober review appear flippant, or at least petty. A biography of a man still living, and still very active, by a fellow preacher and son-in-law, will be received with caution outside of evangelical circles—especially when the birthplace of the subject has already been established as an official shrine (p. 17).

George Washington Truett was born in North Carolina on May 6, 1867. While yet in his teens he crossed to Georgia as a teacher, and at twenty founded an academy which in two years boasted three hundred students. At twenty-three he became financial agent for Baylor University and raised $92,000 to pay off its debt, giving his own entire fortune to the cause. At twenty-six he entered that institution as a student, and, upon graduation, accepted a call to the First Baptist Church of Dallas where he has served since. He has refused the presidency of Baylor; served as a chaplain in France; held annual camp meetings for the cowboys of West Texas; made Dallas a great Baptist center; was several times chosen president of the Southern Baptist Association; was elected president of the World Baptist Alliance at Berlin in 1934; and has become one of the great figures of America as a pastor and a preacher.

No one can justly deny that Dr. Truett is all that his kinsman says that he is. But the adjectives are poured on rather thickly. To adulate Dr. Truett is somewhat like "painting the lily" or decorating the Taj Mahal. Dr. Truett does not need it.

The impartial reader will note several vital omissions in this "authorized" biography. Although other prominent Baptists are mentioned in their relations with Dr. Truett, they do not stand on their own feet. Seemingly the author has no consciousness that religious bodies exist in Texas other than Baptists. Although the Hayden-Cranfill controversy is discussed in two or three pages, the Reverend J. Frank Norris and his group are completely ignored—doubtless in the interest of harmony—which is like writing a biography of Washington and ignoring the Revolution. It is not, therefore, a definitive biography. It was, however, written to serve a lofty purpose—to rally a denomination—and it will do that.

Southern Methodist University H. A. TREXLER

Historical News and Notices

The fifth annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association will convene in Lexington, Kentucky, November 2-4. The following is the tentative program, complete except for a paper on Southern literature and the selection of presiding officers, as announced by the Program Committee chairman, James W. Patton. This year the meetings are to begin on Thursday afternoon rather than in the morning to allow sufficient time for members to arrive. The session scheduled for the first afternoon will be devoted to "Non-Southerners in the South." D. H. Gilpatrick, Furman University, will present a paper on "Refugee Journalists," Philip D. Jordan, Miami University, has selected the topic, "Northern Singers in the Ante-Bellum South," and Ella Lonn, Goucher College, will complete the program with a paper on "Foreigners in the Confederacy." Thursday night, members of the Association will be honored with a complimentary dinner, tendered by citizens of Lexington and members of the Kentucky State Historical Society, the Bradford Historical Society, and the Filson Club. The presiding officer will be H. V. McChesney, and two papers will be read, "R. J. Breckinridge," by Hambleton Tapp, Louisville Male High School, and "The Supreme Court for the District of Kentucky, 1782-1892," by Judge Samuel M. Wilson. Two programs are listed for Friday morning developing the subjects, "Southern Indians" and "Economic History of the Ante-Bellum South." The first will include the following topics: "Indian Contributions to Southern Culture," by Peter A. Brannon, Alabama State Archives, "Cherokee Culture" (tentative title), by Morris L. Wardell, University of Oklahoma, and "Archaeological Discoveries in the Tennessee Valley," by T. M. N. Lewis, University of Tennessee. The other meeting will hear the following papers: "Relations between Planter and Factor in the Rice Industry," by J. H. Easterby, College of Charleston, "The Credit System and the Cotton Trade," by Thomas P. Govan, University of Chattanooga, and "Economic Phases of Sugar Planting," by J. Carlyle Sitterson, University of North Carolina. At noon Friday, a luncheon followed by the regular annual business meeting and the election of officers will be held. A "General Session on the Civil War and Reconstruction," is called for Friday afternoon, to be followed by a general discussion. James G. Randall, University of Illinois, will read a paper on "The Civil War Re-examined," and Howard K. Beale, University of North Carolina, will discuss a topic tentatively entitled "Re-writing the History of the Reconstruction Period." The Annual Dinner will be held

as usual on Friday night and at that time Charles S. Sydnor will present his presidential address.

Saturday morning the Association members will have the choice of attending either the session upon "Aspects of Southern Church History," or the meeting having as its general subject, "Southern Relations with Europe." Phases of Southern church history that are to be discussed are: "The Reunion of the Episcopal Church, 1865," by Henry T. Shanks, Birmingham-Southern College, "The Methodist Church in the Post-Bellum Period" (tentative title), by Hunter D. Farish, Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated, and "The Presbyterian Church U. S. A. and Southern Reconstruction," by Oliver S. Heckman, Pennsylvania Department of Education, Harrisburg. The second-named general topic will embrace the following papers: "French Interests in the Annexation of Texas," by Richard A. McLemore, State Teachers College, Hattiesburg, Mississippi, "European Factors Affecting Southern Trade," by Thomas P. Martin, Library of Congress, and "A Georgian at the Court of the Hapsburgs," by C. Lee Harwell, Emory University Junior College. The final meeting will be a luncheon conference on Southern literature, tendered with the compliments of Transylvania College. The paper, "Southern Story-Telling in the New York *Spirit of the Times,* 1835-1860," by Franklin J. Meine, Chicago, has been designated for this program and another is to be arranged.

PERSONAL

Recent appointments among the Southern universities and colleges include Josephine Hege and Christiana McFadyen as instructors in history, Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, to replace Katherine Strateman and Jane Lohrer who have resigned to be married; Georgia Robison, assistant professor of history at Hollins College; Henry L. Swint, instructor in history at Vanderbilt University; Rembert W. Patrick, assistant professor of history at Meredith College; Judson C. Ward, Jr., instructor in history at South Georgia State Teachers College; Stuart Noblin, instructor in history at the College of Charleston. Vernon L. Wharton will return to Millsaps College as assistant professor of history.

Summer appointments not previously listed include David A. Lockmiller, North Carolina State College, who taught at Emory University, and Elizabeth Cometti, who taught at the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina.

Promotions in the University of Kentucky department of history include the following: J. Huntley Dupre from associate professor to full professor; Thomas D. Clark from assistant professor to the rank of associate professor. At the University of Arkansas, Dorsey D. Jones has been advanced from the rank of asso-

ciate professor to that of professor and W. C. Askew from the rank of instructor to that of assistant professor.

H. C. Nixon will relieve Elmer Ellis, University of Missouri, for the next year while the latter is on leave of absence. Jonas Viles will teach only part time for the first semester in order to complete his study of the history of the University of Missouri.

A. S. Venable, University of Arkansas, has received a grant-in-aid from the Social Science Research Council for work on his "Public Career of William L. Yancey."

Ellery L. Hall, University of Kentucky, is spending the summer in London doing research in the British archives.

There have been several recent changes in the personnel of the Historical Records Survey that will interest Southern historians. P. L. Rainwater resigned as director of the survey in Mississippi July 15; Mona Evans, formerly instructor in history at Mississippi State College for Women and for some years connected with the WPA, joined the Mississippi staff July 1; Ike Moore, who has resigned as state supervisor of the survey in Texas to become director of the San Jacinto Museum of History, has been succeeded by Charles Hodges, former assistant state supervisor; Dan Lacy, state director of the North Carolina survey, has been appointed regional supervisor of the survey work in Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida; Morris Radoff, field supervisor of the Historical Records Survey for Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia, has been appointed archivist of the state of Maryland, succeeding the late Dr. James A. Robertson; Burnis Walker, in charge of the Early American Imprints Survey in Louisiana, has resigned to accept a position with the Library of Congress to work on the Union Catalog.

J. Carlisle Sitterson of the University of North Carolina delivered on January 11 an address, "The Influence of Men of the Lower Cape Fear upon Late Colonial Development," at the annual pilgrimage of the North Carolina Society, Colonial Dames of America, to the ruins of St. Phillips Church, Brunswick County.

The American Library Association will have as its representative to the fifteenth International Conference on Documentation at Zurich, Switzerland, August 10-13, Vernon D. Tate, chief of the Division of Photographic Archives and Research, The National Archives. While in Europe Dr. Tate will study methods of photographic reproduction.

Roscoe R. Hill, chief of the Division of Classification, The National Archives,

has been honored by the *Academia de la Historia de Cuba* which conferred upon him the rank of *Académico Correspondiente* in recognition of his work as a historian.

Miss Irene A. Wright has resigned her position in the Division of Reference, The National Archives, to accept an appointment in the Division of Cultural Relations of the Department of State.

The death of Dr. James A. Robertson, March 20, 1939, closed the career of a scholar who was long identified with Southern history. His interest centered in the areas of the United States which were once under Spanish domination. He made his contribution by editing documents relating to Spanish Louisiana and Florida and, as editor of the *Hispanic American Historical Review,* gave much attention to this same field. Always interested in documentary sources, he devoted much time to securing from the Spanish archives photo copies and transcripts of documents relating to the history of Florida. His last years were spent as Archivist of the State of Maryland, during which time he brought together in the Hall of Records many colonial documents and laid the foundations for a model state department of archives. He was ever ready to encourage and aid younger students who undertook studies regarding the Spanish phases of Southern history. His counsel and advice will be greatly missed, and by his going the readers and friends of the *Journal of Southern History* have suffered a distinct loss. [Roscoe R. Hill]

Edward Everett Dale was honored for his twenty-five years of service in the department of history at the University of Oklahoma by a testimonial dinner, May 15.

John Tate Lanning, associate professor of history in Duke University, has been appointed managing editor of the *Hispanic American Historical Review* to succeed the late Dr. Robertson. Alan K. Manchester, also of the Duke University history faculty, has been appointed associate managing editor.

"Sources of the South's Social and Economic Problems," was the general theme for the Conference on Southern Life and Culture, which met at Louisiana State University, April 17 and 18. The sessions for the first day included the following subjects and speakers: "Obstacles to Intellectual Progress in the South," by Gerald W. Johnson, associate editor, Baltimore *Evening Sun,* "Cultural Elements Differentiating the South from Other Regions," by Howard W. Odum, University of North Carolina, and "The Interterritorial Freight-Rate Situation as a Problem of the South," by John H. Goff, Tennessee Valley Authority. The program for the second day began with a paper by Francis W. Coker, Yale University, on "The Relation of Southern Political Ideas to Present Maladjustments." A round-table discussion, "The Economic Basis of Sectional Politics in

the South," was led by Arthur N. Holcombe, Harvard University. In the afternoon Doak S. Campbell, George Peabody College for Teachers, presented a paper entitled "Why the South Lags in Education." The final meeting was held on Tuesday evening. Each meeting was followed by a discussion with prominent educators and administrators presiding.

The Dancy Foundation Lectures were given by Douglas Southall Freeman, at Alabama College, April 27 and 28. The lectures had as their general subject, "The South to Posterity: A Review of Southern Historical Literature and Memoirs Since 1865." The topic was considered in three divisions, "Writing in the Ashes," "The Appeal to the Records," and "Apotheosis and Realism."

John C. L. Andreassen, regional supervisor Historical Records Survey, read a paper March 31 before the Florida Library Association at Mount Plymouth, Florida, on the survey in the Southeastern states.

S. C. Dellinger, curator of the museum of the University of Arkansas, has secured a grant of $115,000 from WPA for archaeological excavations.

Grants-in-aid of research in American history will be available for 1940 from the Rutherford B. Hayes—Lucy Webb Hayes Foundation of the Hayes Memorial Library. "The Trustees of the Hayes Foundation are prepared to offer a number of grants-in-aid to individual students to assist them in carrying on studies in American History, within the period from the Civil War to the Spanish American War. The Committee is particularly interested in the economic, educational and cultural history of the South, the reconciliation and knitting together of the sections, the history of the development of federal and state administration, and some phases of cultural, social and political history of the United States as well as of Ohio commencing in the eighteen-forties."

Applications must be in before January 15. Those who may wish further information concerning the grants should address their inquiries to Curtis W. Garrison, Secretary for the Committee on Grants of the Hayes Foundation, Hayes Memorial Library, Fremont, Ohio.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The Mississippi Valley Historical Association held its thirty-second annual meeting in Memphis, Tennessee, April 20-22. James G. Randall, University of Illinois, was elected president of the Association; Charles H. Ambler, West Virginia University, Dwight L. Dumond, University of Michigan, and Everett Dick, Union College, Nebraska, were elected members of the executive committee for three years; Merle Curti, Columbia University, and George F. Howe, University of Cincinnati, were appointed members of the board of editors of the

Mississippi Valley Historical Review for three years; and Burr W. Phillips, University of Minnesota, Chester McA. Destler, South Georgia Teachers College, and Robert M. La Follett, Ball State Teachers College, were appointed members of the executive committee for three years.

The Southern Historical Association and the Mississippi Valley Historical Association held two joint meetings at Memphis. The first was a dinner, April 21, with Charles W. Ramsdell as toastmaster. A regular session, April 22, treating the general subject "Some Phases of Town Life in the Ante-Bellum South," had as its chairman, Frank L. Owsley, vice-president of the Southern Historical Association. The following papers were read: Mack Swearingen, "New Orleans: A Missed Opportunity for Cultural Leadership"; F. Garvin Davenport, "Scientific Interests in Ante-Bellum Nashville"; and Gerald M. Capers, Jr., "Ante-Bellum Memphis: A Study of Its Commercial Interests." There were several other papers which dealt with subjects of Southern import, the account of which will appear in the September issue of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review.*

The Oklahoma Historical Society held its annual meeting at Durant on May 11. A trip was made to the historic Fort Washita. In the evening in the auditorium of the state college at Durant, addresses were presented by Judge John B. Meserve of Tulsa on the Chickasaw Indians, and by Rex Strickland of the El Paso branch of the University of Texas on "Miller County Arkansas Territory, the Frontier that Men Forget." The following day a tour of historical sites included Old Wheelock Church, which has stood from pre-Civil War days; Fort Towson; the grave of Robert M. Jones, distinguished Choctaw Confederate delegate to the Richmond government; and the Goodland Indian Orphanage, which has been in continuous service since ante-bellum years.

The Georgia Historical Society celebrated in Savannah, May 24, the centennial of its founding. During the afternoon a pilgrimage was made to Fort Pulaski, Bonaventure, Bethesda, and Wormsoe; in the evening a banquet was held at the Hotel Savannah. Avery Craven of the University of Chicago made the principal address, on "Georgia and the South." Other speakers were S. V. Sanford, chancellor of the University System of Georgia, Edward Alexander Parsons, president of the Louisiana Historical Society, and Judge A. B. Lovett, former president of the Georgia Historical Society. J. Randolph Anderson, president of the society, was toastmaster.

The Florida Historical Society held a two-day joint meeting with the Jacksonville Historical Society in Jacksonville and Fernandina, May 2 and 3. A luncheon and policy conference of the officers and directors of the state society at the Roosevelt Hotel, Jacksonville, inaugurated the meeting. On the first afternoon,

members and guests of the state and local societies toured Fort George Island, where brief descriptive talks were made by Mrs. Millar Wilson and Carita Doggett Corse of Jacksonville, and W. J. Winter of St. Augustine. In the evening a dinner was held at the Roosevelt Hotel, presided over by Joshua C. Chase, former president of the state society. The guest speaker at the dinner, Charles E. Bennett, presented a paper on the history of Fort Caroline. Judge J. Ollie Edmunds, first vice-president of the local society, presided at the evening session. Subjects and speakers included, "Life of James Ormond," by William Barfield, and "Inventories of Archives as Tools for the Historian," by Luther H. Evans, National Director, Historical Records Survey.

On the second day, members assembled at the Keystone Hotel, Fernandina. Judge Burton Barrs, Jacksonville, presided and introduced the following speakers: William J. Deegan, Jr., "Address of Welcome"; George E. Wolff, "A Brief Historical Sketch of Fernandina"; Robert Edwards, "J. J. Dickison, the Francis Marion of Florida"; Joella Hughes, "Life of Jean Ribaut." Thomas M. Carnegie, Jr., was unavoidably absent, and his paper, "The Relationship of Cumberland Island to Florida," was read by Mrs. A. F. Wilson, of Ormond Beach. The meeting adjourned to Fort Clinch where Mrs. Linwood Jeffreys, State Conservation Board, gave a brief history of the Fort, and Mr. and Mrs. W. N. Galphin of Fernandina, presented a set of Florida flags to the Fort Clinch State Park. The two-day meeting was brought to a close with a seafood luncheon at picturesque Gerbing's, where George W. Gibbs, nephew of General Duncan L. Clinch, served as toastmaster. Large exhibits of Florida history materials were displayed at the Jacksonville Public Library and at the Keystone Hotel in Fernandina.

A special committee on archaeology was announced at a board meeting of the Florida Historical Society, May 2, by the president, A. J. Hanna, Rollins College. Its purpose is to arouse interest and stimulate responsibility in the preservation of archaeological remains in Florida, to develop studies in and disseminate information about Florida archaeology, and to encourage the establishment of a department of anthropology (including archaeology) in one or more of the colleges or universities of Florida. W. J. Winter of the Carnegie Institute, now stationed at St. Augustine, was named chairman of this committee.

An informal meeting of members and guests of the Florida Historical Society in Central Florida was held in Winter Park, May 27, to hear John R. Swanton of the Smithsonian Institution speak on the work of the De Soto Quadricentennial Commission, of which he is chairman, and describe the route followed by De Soto on his expedition through Florida.

A celebration was held on January 25 in the new North Carolina Hall of History when the Seaboard Air Line Railway presented to the North Carolina Historical Commission a full-size replica of the *Raleigh,* first locomotive to

operate on the Raleigh and Gaston Railroad, a line which now forms a part of the Seaboard.

The Greensboro, North Carolina, Historical Museum was opened at its new quarters with a formal celebration on April 29.

On June 7 a celebration was held at the old Dickson house, near Hillsboro, North Carolina, which has recently been restored. This house is thought to have been the headquarters of General Joseph E. Johnston when he surrendered to Sherman.

Governor Clyde R. Hoey and others addressed a meeting, May 4, gathered to celebrate the one-hundred-seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of New Bern (North Carolina) Academy.

The North Carolina General Assembly has authorized the erection on Capitol Square of a memorial to the late Captain Samuel A'Court Ashe, historian and editor, who died on October 10, 1938.

Announcement is made by Kenneth Chorley, president of Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated, of the appointment of a committee of historians to assist in an advisory capacity in the historical work of the Department of Research and Record of the Restoration. Members of this advisory committee will participate primarily in connection with the projected series of historical and scholarly publications on colonial Virginia life which has been undertaken by the department. Invitations to serve on this committee have been accepted by Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, Princeton University; Charles M. Andrews, Yale University; Arthur M. Schlesinger, and Samuel E. Morison, Harvard University; Virginius Dabney, Richmond *Times Dispatch*; Earl G. Swem, and Richard L. Morton, College of William and Mary. Members of this committee are to convene in Williamsburg from time to time. Their first conference was to be held June 20-21.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

An Early Description of Middle Tennessee (Chicago: Privately printed, 1939, pp. 8), by E. Bushnell, edited, with an introductory note, by Douglas C. McMurtrie, was handed to members in attendance at the Memphis meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. The letter was taken from the columns of the New-London *Connecticut Gazette,* November 21, 1788. Mr. McMurtrie says in his introduction that "Bushnell's description of the country in the vicinity of Nashville may have been a bit over-enthusiastic, but it was letters such as his which set in motion and kept moving the westward stream of migration, which was responsible for the rapid growth in population and wealth of the west."

Two mimeographed inventories by the Historical Records Survey have been received recently in the *Journal* office. The *Inventory of the County Archives of Arkansas, No. 12, Cleburne County* (Little Rock: Historical Records Survey, 1939, pp. 217), is the first volume to be issued by the Survey in that state. The sixth *Inventory of the Parish Archives of Louisiana* is *No. 44, St. Bernard Parish* (University, Louisiana: The Department of Archives, Louisiana State University, 1938, pp. 166). In both inventories the historian will find the historical sketches of the locality and the discussion of local governmental organization immediately valuable; their usefulness as a guide to unprinted sources will be generally recognized.

The publication of the *Journal of the History of Ideas* will be a valuable and welcome addition to scholarly journals. It is intended as a medium for the publication of researches which cross the customary boundary lines or are likely to be of common interest to students in different fields of the history of philosophy, of literature and the arts, of the natural and social sciences, of religion, and of political and social movements. Arthur O. Lovejoy, Johns Hopkins University, has been chosen editor, to be assisted by Philip P. Wiener, managing editor, and Joseph T. Shipley, assistant editor.

Delegates from leading educational institutions in the United States and foreign countries attended the centennial celebration of Duke University, April 21-23. Duke University Press has published several interesting works as a part of the commemoration of the centennial. Reviews of these works appear in this and subsequent issues of the *Journal.*

Recent acquisitions to the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina include: the papers of Hugh McGavock of Rockbridge County, Virginia; an addition to the Jacob M. Dickinson Papers; a collection of fifty letters to and from Felix Grundy; a marriage record book and autograph album kept by the Reverend Archibald McFadyen of North Carolina; five plantation records, 1861-1865, of Phanor Prudhomme of Bermuda Plantation, Natchitoches Parish, Louisiana; the papers of Theodore Richmond of Ohio and Tennessee; the order book kept by Colonel S. H. Lockett, who was in charge of the defenses of Vicksburg; the papers of Marion Butler, of North Carolina, Populist leader and United States senator; the papers of William A. Graham, governor of North Carolina, United States senator, secretary of the navy, member of the secession convention, president *pro tem* of the Confederate Senate, member of the Peabody Board and the Maryland-Virginia boundary commission; the papers of Matt W. Ransom, attorney general of North Carolina, Confederate general, United States senator, and minister to Mexico; a collection of papers of Governor James McDowell of Virginia; a collection of letters of Mary Moore Watters of Wilmington, North Carolina; a few important letters and other

papers of Franklin H. Elmore of South Carolina; the diary of Grace Elmore; the papers of Elmer Roberts of Indiana and Florida, for many years a European representative of the Associated Press; the diary of Kate S. Carney of Murfreesboro, Tennessee; an account and record book of Charles Henry Campfield of Georgia; one volume of the diary of Moses Young Henderson of Georgia; two volumes of the diary of Laura Beecher (Mrs. James) Comer of Alabama; a large addition to the Elliott-Mackay-Stiles Papers; a collection of the papers of Dr. J. Marion Sims, the eminent surgeon, a native of South Carolina; twenty-eight additional volumes of the Arthur P. Gorman scrapbooks; the plantation diary of Alexander J. Lawton of Beaufort District, South Carolina; the Appleton-Arnold Papers, including many letters and many volumes of the diary of Louisa Arnold Appleton; the papers of the Dickens family of Fairfax, Virginia, including numerous important record books; a typewritten copy of the diary of Joseph Cottrell of Florida; a typewritten copy of the Civil War letters of Captain George Cadman, United States army; diary of Margaret Anne Ulmer of Grove Hill, Alabama; and the papers of William L. Saunders, Confederate soldier, editor, secretary of state of North Carolina, secretary of the Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina for many years, and editor of the *Colonial Records of North Carolina.*

The Filson Club has purchased a large assortment of newspapers from Georgetown College.

Recent acquisitions of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History include: opinions of the attorney general, February 1-April 28, 1893, June 22, 1894-September 19, 1895, January 15, 1900-September 2, 1930; record of charters, February 9, 1910-December 21, 1932; Supreme Court docket, October term, 1903-October term, 1910; civil docket, March term, 1900-October term, 1901, October term, 1920-March term, 1928; criminal docket, October term, 1913-March term, 1919. The following acquisitions are particularly valuable for the researcher in Mississippi history: Mississippi *Senate Journal,* fourth session, January 1-February 10, 1821; fifth session, November 5-November 27, 1821; fifth session, June 3-June 29, 1822; sixth session, December 23, 1822-January 21, 1823; seventh session, December 22, 1823-January 23, 1824; eighth session, January 3-February 4, 1825.

The Department has also acquired the papers of Brigadier General Thomas J. McKean relating to the Battle of Corinth. These contain field dispatches, casualty lists, general orders, telegrams, and reports of commanding and minor officers. Some of the famous names, besides McKean, that are signed to the various documents are Grant, Rosecrans, Kirby, McArthur, William T. Clark, and G. Goddard.

Valuable manuscript materials have recently been added and others made

available to the McClung Historical Room of Lawson McGhee Library, Knoxville, Tennessee. About 500 papers of William B. Lenoir, merchant and founder of Lenoir City, have been acquired. The J. Hays Allin Papers, which deal with real estate business in Chattanooga, the Presbyterian Church in East Tennessee, and the Allin family, have been calendared. The T. A. R. Nelson Papers, of about 6,000 pieces, are being calendared and will be completed in a few months. Nelson, a member of Congress from East Tennessee during the Civil War period, was in touch with the political and social life of the section from 1830 to 1870. These papers, mainly correspondence, include some Andrew Johnson and "Parson" W. G. Brownlow letters. The Will A. McTeer Papers, of about 12,000 pieces, are arranged and available for use. McTeer was a prominent lawyer and Presbyterian leader of Maryville, Tennessee, and his papers, 1876-1918, consist of personal, commercial, and legal material and account books relating to Maryville College. A collection valuable for its political and legal information, the Leonidas C. Houk and John C. Houk Papers, about 30,000 pieces covering the period 1870-1923, is ready for use. The Houks were lawyers and Republican congressmen from Tennessee. The arrangement of the manuscripts was made possible through the aid of the Historical Records Survey.

Papers concerning the Burr conspiracy and the preparations to try Aaron Burr and Harmon Blennerhassett in the United States Circuit Court at Chillicothe, Ohio, in 1808, have been transferred to The National Archives from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio. The documents date from 1805 to 1808 and include the recognizances of the defendants given at Richmond, Virginia, following the trials there; the bills of indictment returned by the Ohio grand jury, charging Burr and Blennerhassett with high misdemeanors; and various evidentiary papers.

Experiences of the American privateer *Yankee* in African waters are described in a fragmentary log found among customhouse records in The National Archives. The log covers the period from October 9, 1814, to January 20, 1815, and tells of several naval engagements and of a visit to Boa Vista, one of the Cape Verde Islands. Also of interest to students of American maritime history is the receipt by The National Archives from the Bureau of Customs of bodies of correspondence with collectors of customs, 1789-1907, and from the customhouse in New York, of crew lists of vessels entering or clearing there, 1803-1919, and shipping articles for the crews of ships sailing thence, 1840-1914.

Other records recently transferred include correspondence of the Division of Insolvent National Banks, from the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, 1865-1937; maps, many of which deal with the Seminole Indian wars in Florida, from the Office of the Chief of Engineers, 1817-1857; personnel records relating to the Department of Justice and the Federal judiciary, 1870-1908; requisitions and contracts from the Bureau of Ordnance, 1899-1935; correspondence of the

Forester's Office, 1883-1905; correspondence relating to entomological activities, from the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, 1883-1924; and records of the International Fisheries Commissions established in 1908 and 1924.

During the past twelve months the Department of Archives of Louisiana State University has acquired more than one hundred collections of manuscripts. The most important are as follows: The Blankenstein and Veiner Collection, 400 vols. (1890-1933), contains the records of a Natchez wholesale grocery store in a period when the trade area of that city was contracting in size. The Dupont Collection, 78 vols. (1893-1933), comprises the records of a store at Houma, Louisiana, which served a large trade region. The Hartzell Papers, 735 items (1864-1874, 1899-1906), embrace the correspondence of Reverend J. C. Hartzell as pastor of the Ames Methodist Episcopal Church (North) in New Orleans, and later as Bishop of Africa. The Mandeville Papers, 1692 items (1816-1893), constitute records of a prominent Natchez family; many phases of non-political ante-bellum life are mirrored—the activities of women in Natchez homes and near-by plantations; the efforts of a young man to obtain a beginning in New Orleans business life; fashions, morals, epidemics, theatricals, music, and dancing in New Orleans, Natchez, Hot Springs, and New York; life behind the lines and at the front during the Civil War; and the business of the Planters Bank of Natchez. The Minor Collection, 1,287 items (1793-1898), is strong in data concerning speculation in land and cotton in the 1830's; the management of four plantations in the Natchez region from 1840 to 1870; treatment of Negroes; the effect of the Civil War on Mississippi Negroes; planters' relationships with several Mississippi banks; and horse racing. The collection includes plantation diaries, 1847-1870. The Meullion Papers, 121 items (1776-1906), contain significant materials on free Negroes in St. Landry Parish, Louisiana. The Shealy Papers, 51 items (1859, 1862), include the wartime impressions of the privations and horrors of camp and hospital life in Virginia. The most important part of the Stratton Collection, 67 items (1746-1903), is the diary (1843-1903) of Reverend J. B. Stratton, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Natchez. The diary of Clara Solomon, 250 pp. in 4 vols. (1861-1862), is an intimate account of the life of a New Orleans woman during the Civil War. The Taylor Collection, 2,095 items (1813-1913), is rich in materials on the lumber industry, land speculation, saltmaking, and education in southwestern Mississippi and southern Louisiana in the three decades ending in 1870.

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"Tchaikowsky's Visit to Baltimore," by James Morfit Mullen, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (March).

"Ships and Shipping of Seventeenth Century Maryland," continued, by V. J. Wyckoff, *ibid.*

"The First American Edition of Captain John Smith's *True Travels* and *General Historie*," by Richard Beale Davis, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April).

"The Seed from Which Virginia Grew," by George Arents, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (April).

"Lt. Col. Leven Powell," by James D. Evans, *ibid.*

" 'Mr' in Virginia Records before 1776," by Charles Edgar Gilliam, *ibid.*

"The Colonial Churches of York County, Virginia," by George Carrington Mason, *ibid.*

"Agricultural Science and Education in Virginia before 1860," by Ralph M. Brown, *ibid.*

"Economic Conditions in North Carolina about 1780," I, by Francis G. Morris and Phyllis M. Morris, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (April).

"Economic Sectionalism in Ante-Bellum North Carolina," by Joseph Carlyle Sitterson, *ibid.*

"The Plank Road Movement in North Carolina," II, by Robert B. Starling, *ibid.*

"The Land Title to Liberty Hall," by Willard Rouse Jillson, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (April).

"A Sketch of the Life and Times of Rebecca Witten Graham, of Floyd County, Kentucky, 1775-1843," by *id., ibid.*

"John Graham of Virginia and Kentucky, 1765-1835," by *id.*, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (April).

"Matthew Harris Jouett, Kentucky Portrait Painter, A Review," by Samuel M. Wilson, *ibid.*

"Kentucky and the Greek War of Independence, 1821-1828," by Huntley Dupre, *ibid.*

"Educational Opportunities in Early Missouri," I, by Margaret McMillan and Monia Cook Morris, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (April).

"The War of 1812 on the Missouri Frontier," III, by Kate L. Gregg, *ibid.*

"Peter James Hudson," by R. L. Williams, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (March).

"A Story of Choctaw Chiefs," by Peter James Hudson, *ibid.*

"Chief Colonel Johnson Harris," by John Bartlett Meserve, *ibid.*

"A Brief History of Early Higher Education among the Baptists of Oklahoma," by Fred G. Watts, *ibid.*

"Early Creek Missions," by Roland Hinds, *ibid.*

"Early History of Noble County," by Allen D. Fitchett, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"Seventeenth Century Books Relating to Maryland," by John W. Garrett, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (March).

"A Letter from Samuel Morse, the Inventor of the Telegraph," contributed by James A. Robertson, *ibid.*

"The Sculptured Panels of Old St. Paul's Church, Baltimore," by I. T. Frary, *ibid.*

"Stricker Letters," contributed by Alice Harris Brent, *ibid.*

" 'Smithfield' Home of the Prestons, in Montgomery County, Virginia," by Janie P. B. Lamb, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April).

"Notes from the Records of Stafford County, Virginia, Order Books," continued, *ibid.*

"Hinges from Old Houses," by Rev. and Mrs. Arthur P. Gray, *ibid.*

"Marriage License Records of Northumberland County, Virginia, from 1735 to 1795 as Recorded in Clerk's Fee Books," concluded, compiled by Lillian A. Hatton, *ibid.*

"Letters from Old Trunks: A Letter from Agnes Sarah Bell Cabell," edited by Mr. and Mrs. John H. Guy, *ibid.*

"Montgomery County's Revolutionary Heritage," concluded, compiled by Ruby A. Roberts, *ibid.*

"William and Mary College as a Hospital in 1862," contributed by Fred W. Cross, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly and Historical Magazine* (April).

"George Tucker's Description of Williamsburg in 1796," copied by John C. Wyllie, *ibid.*

"Note from Surry County Records Which Relates to Education," contributed by Mrs. Victor W. Stewart, *ibid.*

"Notes from Surry County Records Which Relate to Seventeenth Century Houses," contributed by Robert Hunt Land, *ibid.*

"Cumberland County Papers and Lists of Colonial Soldiers," contributed by W. S. Morton, *ibid.*

"Unpublished Letters from North Carolina to Polk," continued, by Elizabeth G. McPherson, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (April).

"North Carolina Bibliography, 1937-1938," compiled by Mary Lindsay Thornton, *ibid.*

"Mercer County, Kentucky, Abstracts of Will Books 3 and 4," in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (April).

"Kentucky Marriages and Obituaries," continued, compiled and edited by G. Glenn Clift, *ibid.*

"Letters of James Chamberlayne Pickett," edited by James A. Padgett, *ibid.*

"Letters of George Caleb Bingham to James S. Rollins," VII, edited by C. B. Rollins, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (April).

"The Opening of Oklahoma from the European Point of View," translated and edited by H. C. Peterson, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (March).

"Autobiography of Governor A. J. Seay," edited by Dan W. Peery, *ibid.*

"The Cherokee Commission at Kickapoo Village," edited by Berlin B. Chapman, *ibid.*

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"Spanish Mission Sites in Florida," by Mark F. Boyd, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (April).

"Governor Johnstone in West Florida," by C. N. Howard, *ibid.*

"The Parentage and Birthplace of Osceola," by Charles H. Coe, *ibid.*

"The Legend of Sir Walter Raleigh at Savannah," by Dolores B. Floyd, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (June).

"Causton's Bluff, Deptford, Brewton Hill: Three Allied Plantations," II, Savannah Unit, Federal Writers' Project, *ibid.*

"The Bank of Hamburg, South Carolina," by Charles G. Cordle, *ibid.*

"The Graviers and the Faubourg Ste. Marie," by Francis P. Burns, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (April).

"The Early History of the Episcopal Church in New Orleans, 1805-1840," by Georgia Fairbanks Taylor, *ibid.*

"J. D. B. De Bow and the Seventh Census," by Ottis Clark Skipper, *ibid.*

" 'Who Killa De Chief?' " by John S. Kendall, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"Taken from the Historical Records of the 30th Regiment in South Carolina, 1775," contributed by Allen French, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (April).

"Journal of Gen. Peter Horry," continued, edited by A. S. Salley, *ibid.*

"The Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1765-1775," continued, contributed by Mabel L. Webber, copied by Elizabeth Heyward Jervey, *ibid.*

"Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette of Charleston, S. C.," contributed by Elizabeth Heyward Jervey, *ibid.*

"The Panton, Leslie Papers: Letters of *Edmund Doyle,* Trader, 1817," in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (April).

"Alexander Smith Atkinson, 1815-1894," by Edith Stetson Coleman, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (June).

"Letters of Georgia Editors and a Correspondent," edited by David K. Jackson, *ibid.*

"Statistics and Cross-Sections of the Georgia Press to 1870," by Kenneth W. Rawlings, *ibid.*

"A Faithful Ex-Slave Rewarded," by D. M. McKeithan, *ibid.*

"Papers Relating to the Georgia-Florida Frontier, 1784-1800," XI, edited and translated by D. C. Corbitt, *ibid.*

"Old Canoochee Backwoods Sketches," VI, by Julia E. Harn, *ibid.*

"Minutes of the First Session of the Assembly of West Florida (November 3, 1766-January 3, 1767)," edited by James A. Padgett, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (April).

"Records of the Superior Council of Louisiana, April-July, 1753," LXXIX, by Heloise H. Cruzat, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*

"Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana, November, 1783," LXI, by Laura L. Porteous, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES AND COMPILATIONS

"The Attack upon West Point during the Civil War," by Harry Williams, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (March).

"New Light on the Yankee Peddler," by Priscilla C. Kline, in the *New England Quarterly* (March).

"The Rise of the Antislavery Movement in Southwestern Pennsylvania," by Robert Wallace Brewster, in the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* (March).

" 'Prock's' Last Letters to the Vincennes Western Sun," in the *Indiana Magazine of History* (March).

"The Distinctiveness of Southern Culture," by Wilson Gee, in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (April).

"Constance Fenimore Woolson and the South," by Fred Lewis Pattee, *ibid.*

"Post-War Diversions of the Rural South," by Josiah Moffatt, *ibid.*

"Mr. Daniels Discovers the South," by Frank L. Owsley, in the *Southern Review* (Spring).

"Hillbilly Realism," by C. Vann Woodward, *ibid.*

"History and Historians at Chicago," by the Editors, in the *American Historical Review* (April).

"John T. Morgan, Father of the Inter-Oceanic Canal," by A. L. Venable, in the *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* (March).

"The Transition from Slave to Free Agricultural Labor in the Southern States," by Oscar Zeichner, in *Agricultural History* (January).

"Salient Changes in Southern Agriculture since the Civil War," by B. I. Wiley, *ibid.* (April).

"The Overproduction of Cotton and a Possible Remedy," by Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, reprinted, *ibid.*

CONTRIBUTORS

AVERY CRAVEN is professor of history at the University of Chicago.

WALTER PRICHARD is professor of history at Louisiana State University.

RICHARD H. SHRYOCK is professor of history at the University of Pennsylvania.

THEODORE SALOUTOS is research assistant in the department of history of the University of Wisconsin.

FRED LANDON is librarian and associate professor of history at the University of Western Ontario.

GAVIN B. HENDERSON is lecturer on modern history at the University of Glasgow.

EAST TENNESSEE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE

SPECIAL STUDIES IN TENNESSEE HISTORY, No. 1

Sectionalism and Internal Improvements in Tennessee, 1796-1845. By Stanley J. Folmsbee, University of Tennessee, 278 pages. $3.75

Special Introductory Price on orders received before October 15, 1939, $3.25. Discount to libraries, educational institutions, and members of the East Tennessee Historical Society.

ANNUAL *PUBLICATIONS* No. 11 (1939)

PARTIAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

Papers from the Spanish Archives Relating to the Old Southwest, 1783-1800: III, 1787. Trans. and ed. by D. C. and Roberta Corbitt

The "J. Hartsell Memora": the Journal of a Tennessee Captain in the War of 1812. Ed. by Mary H. McCown

The Whigs in the Politics of the Confederacy. By Daniel M. Robison

Removal of the Cherokees, An Unnecessary Tragedy. By J. P. Brown

Branch Banking in Tennessee Prior to the Civil War. By C. A. Campbell

James K. Polk and the "Immortal Thirteen." By Powell Moore

The Freedmen's Bureau in Tennessee. By W. T. Jordan

Writings on Tennessee History, 1938. By Laura Luttrell

Subscription to annual *Publications,* $2.00 per year; copies of the ten previous issues available at $2.00 each.

Some contributors to previous numbers: T. P. Abernethy, E. M. Coulter, W. N. Franklin, P. M. Hamer, W. B. Hesseltine, G. F. Milton, J. W. Patton, C. H. Smith, Robert H. White, S. C. Williams

Order from the Secretary of the Society,
Lawson McGhee Library, Knoxville, Tennessee

THE

PACIFIC HISTORICAL REVIEW

A scholarly journal devoted to the entire Pacific Area

Official organ of the

PACIFIC COAST BRANCH OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

LOUIS KNOTT KOONTZ, *Managing Editor*
JOHN W. CAUGHEY, *Associate Editor*
321 Administration Building, University of California at Los Angeles
Board of Editors: THOMAS A. BAILEY, DAN E. CLARK, W. HENRY COOKE, CHARLES B. FAHS, FREDERIC L. PAXSON, WALTER N. SAGE

Its current and back numbers contain a wealth of material on Australia and the Pacific islands, China and Japan, Alaska, the Canadian West, the American West, and the Pacific nations of Hispanic America.

Eighth year of publication

$4.00 a year

Special rates to students

A sample copy will be sent on request

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

THE SOUTHERN REVIEW

A Critical Quarterly

IN THE SUMMER ISSUE

The Rhetoric of Hitler's "Battle," *Kenneth Burke*
The Genius of Democracy, *R. M. MacIver*
One Majority Against Another: *Populus Sempervirens*, *C. J. Friedrich*
On the Preservation of Democracy for America, *Willmoore Kendall*

FICTION

Family History, *P. M. Pasinetti*
Science and Society, *Lyle Lanier*
Humanism in the World of Einstein, *Herbert J. Muller*
Hulme and the Tragic View, *Dixon Wecter*
The Task of Concentration, *George Every, S. S. M.*
Praise, *Glenway Wescott*
The Death of Ivan Ilyich and Joseph K., *Philip Rahv*

POETRY

Flight of Sons and Other Poems, *David Cornel DeJong*

SHORTER REVIEWS

The Oxford Anthology of American Literature (edited by Benét and Pearson), *R. P. Blackmur*
Sophocles: *Electra* (Francis Fergusson), *Richmond Lattimore*

75c a copy **$3.00 a year**

Published by

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
UNIVERSITY, LA., U.S.A.

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

●

PRESIDENT

CHARLES S. SYDNOR, Duke University

VICE-PRESIDENT

FRANK L. OWSLEY, Vanderbilt University

SECRETARY-TREASURER

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL, University of Texas (1939)
THOMAS P. ABERNETHY, University of Virginia (1940)
PHILIP M. HAMER, The National Archives (1941)

MANAGING EDITOR

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

ELECTED MEMBERS

A. B. MOORE, University of Alabama (1939)
THOMAS S. STAPLES, Hendrix College (1939)
THOMAS D. CLARK, University of Kentucky (1940)
BENJAMIN B. KENDRICK, Woman's College of University of North Carolina (1940)
KATHRYN T. ABBEY, Florida State College for Women (1941)
AVERY O. CRAVEN, University of Chicago (1941)

S. W. Higginbotham

INDEX

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME V

Abbey, Kathryn T., mentioned, 68.
Abernethy, Thomas P., revs. Bodley's *Our First Great West,* 105-106; mentioned, 278.
Abolition, influence in 1855-56 speakership contest, 187 ff.; and slave insurrection panic, 206 ff.; Birney and, movement, 263-64; Nathaniel Ware's views on, 524-25; attacked by Douglas, 529 ff.; background for war, 553-54.
Acheson, Sam, *35,000 Days in Texas,* revd., 270-72.
Adams, George, "Med. Theory and Practice in the Confed.," synop., 70.
Adams, Herbert B., vol. of letters revd., 561-62.
Adams, James H., proposes reopening slave trade, 207.
Adams, John, and So. Indian policy, 448; mentioned, 452.
Adams, John Q., opinion of Berrien, 457.
Agrarians, Ky., and corporations, 35.
Agriculture, in col. S. C., 85 ff.; plantation, 109-110; Fleming lectures on, noted, 275; on So. Wests, 300 ff.; sugar, and Civil War, 315-32; Ger. and Eng. method compared, 343 ff.; on La. plantation, 431-46; and economic theory, 514 ff.
Aiken, William, land speculation, 166, 179; and 1855-56 speakership election, 190 ff.
Alabama, preservation of hist'l records, 6-7; archives law, 10; land speculation in, 156; slave insurrection panic, 218; Slater fund work in, 233 ff.; emigration to, 300 ff.; Negro educ., 404-405; and Indian question, 447; Montgomery address of Douglas, 527-52.
Alabama, Raphael Semmes and, 115-17.
Alabama, Univ. of, library acquisitions, 282.
Alabama: A Social and Economic History of the State, by Marie B. Owen, revd., 394.
Alabama Department of Archives and History, acquisitions, 127.
Alabama Historical Society, archival work, 10.
Alabama History Commission, preserves hist'l records, 10-11.
Alabama Platform, Douglas and, 541 ff.
Albert Kahn Foundation, U. B. Phillips and, 366-67.
Almanac, Tobler, pub. in S. C., 83.
Amelia, S. C., noted, 85.
American Book Company, issue in Ky. politics, 38 ff.
American Caste and the Negro College, by Buell G. Gallagher, revd., 273-74.
American Missionary Association, Negro educ. work, 240.
American Negro Slavery, U. B. Phillips', evaluated, 365.
American Philosophical Society, influence on Ware, 505-506.
"American Society of Equity in Kentucky: A Recent Attempt in Agrarian Reform," by Theodore Saloutos, 347-63.
American Tobacco Company, and Ky. tobacco industry, 347 ff.
Anderson, Charles, revs. Parks' *Segments of So. Thought,* 558-60.
Andreassen, John C. L., "Inventory of MS. Collections in the So.," synop., 66; mentioned, 415.
An Exposition of the Weakness and Inefficiency of the Government of the United States of North America, by Nathaniel Ware, discussed, 508 ff.
Annual meeting, fourth, rpt., 62-75.
"Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer," by Fletcher M. Green, 76-80.
Anthropology, and race theories, 337 ff.
Antimission Baptists, Tenn., 29 ff.
Apalachi, relig. work among, 480 ff.
Appenzellers, emigrants in S. C., 83-98.
Appleman, Roy E., "The Survey of Historic Sites in the So.," synop., 65.
Archives, So., conditions, 4 ff.; state, recommendation for organization, 15-16.
Arkansas, preservation of hist'l records, 7; slave insurrection panic, 216-17; emigration to, 301; Hist'l Records Survey work, 419.

Arkansas, University of, library acquisitions, 130, 281.
Arkansas Handbook, 1937-1938, by Dallas T. Herndon, noted, 131.
Arkansas History Commission, established, 11-12.
Armstrong, Margaret, *Fanny Kemble,* revd., 110-12.
Arnett, Alex M., mentioned, 277.
Arnold, B. W., mentioned, 573.
Art, frontier appreciation, 22.
Arthur, Stanley C., mentioned, 76.
Artrell, W. M., and Slater fund work, 241.
Ashe, Samuel A'Court, death noted, 78, 125; memorial, 418.
Askew, W. C., mentioned, 125, 413.
Attakapas region, sugar planting in, 315 ff.
Augusta, Ga., Ger.-Swiss emigrants near, 83 ff.
Aycock, Charles B., mentioned, 50.

Bache, Franklin, mentioned, 505.
Bacon, Leonard W., and Slater fund, 224-25.
Baker-Crothers, Hays, revs. *Kegley's Va. Frontier,* 103-104.
Bank of the United States, fight against, 397-98; Berrien and, 447 ff.
Banks, effect of Reconstruction on, 54; and land speculation, 163 ff.; and sugar industry, 319 ff.; ante-bellum, and La. agric., 433 ff.
Banks, Nathaniel P., and 1855-56 speakership election, 186 ff.; and La. sugar industry, 320-21.
Baptists, and Tenn. culture, 27 ff.; Truett and, 410.
Barbee, David R. (co-ed.), "The Montgomery Address of Stephen A. Douglas," 527-52.
Barbour, James, and removal of Indians, 447.
Barbour, Philip, nominated for vice-pres., 464.
Barker, Eugene C. (co-ed.), *Writings of Sam Houston, 1813-1863,* revd., 259-61.
Barnes, Gilbert H., mentioned, 365; revs. Griggs' *Thomas Clarkson,* 392-93.
Barnes, Harry E., mentioned, 276.
Barnhart, John D., revs. Kohlmeier's *Old Northwest,* 112-13.
Barrow, Bennet H., as La. planter, 431-46.
Barrow, William, II, mentioned, 432.
Baton Rouge, sugar region, 315 ff.
Bauerlein, George, mentioned, 574.
Bayou Sara, La. entrepôt, 432.
Beale, Howard K., mentioned, 78.
Bean, R. Bennett, *Peopling of Va.,* revd., 257-58.
Bean, W. G., mentioned, 126; revs. Dawson's *A French Regicide in Ala.,* 558.
Beauregard, P. G. T., mentioned, 473.
Beckner, Lucian, and tobacco farmers' organization, 353.
Bell, John, views on frontier culture, 23-24; mentioned, 212.
Bell-Everett party, and 1860 campaign, 247 ff.
Belmont, August, and Ky. politics, 37, 40 ff.; land speculator, 173, 177.
Benjamin, Judah P., influence in Confed. govt., 468-78.
"Bennet H. Barrow, Ante-Bellum Planter of the Felicianas," by Edwin A. Davis, 431-46.
Benton, Thomas H., mentioned, 197.
Bermuda, hist. of, revd., 102-103.
Berrien, John M., and the adm. of Jackson, 447-67.
Berry, John, land speculator, 160.
Berry, Joseph, land speculator, 160.
Bettersworth, John K., mentioned, 279.
Biddle, Nicholas, and Berrien, 450 ff.; mentioned, 505.
Billington, Ray A., *Protestant Crusade,* revd., 266-67.
Binkley, William C., paper on Walter L. Fleming, synop., 74; "Contribution of Walter Lynwood Fleming to So. Scholarship," 143-54; revs. Williams and Barker's (eds.) *Writings of Sam Houston,* 259-61.
Biography of a River Town: Memphis, Its Heroic Age, by Gerald M. Capers, Jr., revd., 554-55.
Biological nature, as hist'l determinant, 333 ff.
Birney, James G., letters, revd., 263-64.
Black Codes, and Reconstruction, 52-53.
Black Folk, Then and Now: An Essay in the History and Sociology of the Negro Race, by W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, revd., 564-65.
Black Man in White America, by John G. Van Deusen, revd., 565-66.
Black Workers and the New Unions, by Horace R. Cayton and George S. Mitchell, revd., 567-68.
Blackburn, Joseph S. C., and Ky. politics, 38 ff.
Blair, Francis P., and Eaton affair, 459 ff.
Blanding, Abram, land speculator, 168.
Blockade, No., effect on sugar industry, 318 ff.
Boas, Franz, mentioned, 339.
Bodley, Temple, *Our First Great West,* revd., 105-106.
Bolton, Herbert E., *Wider Horizons of Am. Hist.,* revd., 563-64.
Bonapartes in America, by Clarence E. Macartney and Gordon Dorrance, revd., 557-58.

Bond, Horace M., *Negro Educ. in Ala.,* revd., 404-405.
Bonham, Milledge L., Jr. (co-ed.), "The Montgomery Address of Douglas," 527-52.
Booth, John Wilkes, study of, revd., 401-402.
Bouchereau, Alcée, sugar statistics, 328 ff.
Bouchereau, Louis, sugar statistics, 328 ff.
Bowers, Claude G., *Tragic Era,* interpretation noted, 49.
Bowie, Thomas F., mentioned, 191, 205.
Bowles, Samuel, views on 1855-56 speakership contest, 196.
Boyce, William W., land speculator, 166, 179.
Boyd, Minnie Clare, mentioned, 126.
Boyd, W. K., death noted, 78; memorial vol. to, noted, 280.
Boylan, Elaine (co-auth.), *A Handbook of Okla. Writers,* revd., 389-90.
Boyle, Jeremiah T., land speculator, 170-71.
Bradford, William, mentioned, 336.
Bradley, William O., Ky. gov., 37 ff.
Brahm, John G. W. de, description of Carolinas, 302.
Bramlette, David C., mentioned, 78.
Branch, John, in Jackson cabinet, 454 ff.
Breckinridge, John C., and land speculations, 166, 179 ff.; campaign for pres., 247 ff.; appointed ambassador to Spain, 380; Douglas' views conc., 540 ff.
Breckinridge, Robert J., land speculator, 178.
Breckinridge, W. C. P., and Ky. politics, 1898, pp. 39 ff.
Brent, Thomas L. L., land speculator, 169-70.
Bright, Jesse, land speculator, 164, 166.
British-American Tobacco Company, and monopoly fight, 347 ff.
Bronston, Charles, mentioned, 39; Ky. textbook bill, 41.
Brooke, Henry L., invests in No. lands, 157-58.
Brooks, Preston S., mentioned, 190, 191, 205; assault on Sumner, 206.
Brown, Albert G., and frontier dem., 308-309; supports homestead bills, 312.
Brown, John P., *Old Frontiers,* revd., 107-108.
Brown, John Y., Ky. gov., 36-40.
Buchanan, James, adm. policy, 173, 174, 176; part in Ostend Manifesto, 373 ff.; Douglas' views conc., 540 ff.
Buck, Solon J., mentioned, 125.
Buckle, Henry T., and geographical determinism, 339.
Buffington, James, and 1855-56 speakership contest, 195.
Buford, Jefferson, land speculator, 172-73.
"Buford Expedition to Kansas," by W. L. Fleming, noted, 149.
Bull, William, S. P. G. missionary, 493 ff.
Bullock, Helen, *Williamsburg Art of Cookery,* noted, 280.
Bullock, Rufus B., recommended for cabinet, 243.
Bunch, Robert, British consul, 209.
Burgess, John W., on the Negro, 58; mentioned, 145.
Burley Tobacco Society, organized, 353; activity, 354 ff.
Burlingame, Anson, and the 1855-56 speakership contest, 191 ff.
Burne, Alfred H., *Lee, Grant and Sherman,* revd., 400-401.
Burns, Edward M., *James Madison,* revd., 258-59.
Butler, Pierce, husband of Fanny Kemble, 111.

Cabell, Landon R., invests in No. lands, 157-58.
Caldwell and Company: A Southern Financial Empire, by John B. McFerrin, revd., 570-71.
Caldwell, John, mentioned, 24.
Caldwell, Wallace E., mentioned, 77.
Calhoun, John C., and N. C. hist., 1824, pp. 396-97; and Jackson adm., 447 ff.; and slavery question, 534.
California, Douglas and, statehood, 534-35.
Callaway, Morgan, and Negro educ., 226.
Callcott, Wilfred H., mentioned, 125, 276.
Calloway, James, land speculator, 177.
Calvinistic doctrine, conflict with frontier philosophy, 27 ff.
Cambreleng, Churchill C., Van Buren partisan, 452-53.
Campbell, Alexander, influence on frontier culture, 31-33.
Campbell, Doak S., mentioned, 415.
Campbell, John, and racial theories, 339.
Campbell, Lewis D., candidate for speakership, 190 ff.
Campbell, Mary R. (Mrs.), mentioned, 124.
Canada, interest in So. hist., 364-65.
Capers, Gerald M., Jr., mentioned, 70; *Biog. of a River Town,* revd., 554-55.
Capital, So., invested in No. lands, 155-85.
Cappon, Lester J., rpts. on Va. hist'l agencies, 73.
Carey, Henry C., nat. economist, 501 ff.
Carey, Mathew, nat. economist, 501 ff.
Carlisle, John G., and Goebel, 36-37.
Carpetbaggers, new viewpoints on, 49 ff.; and La. labor, 330.
Carrington, George, land speculator, 163.
Carroll, H. Bailey, revs. Acheson's *35,000 Days in Texas,* 270-72.
Carroll, Joseph C., *Slave Insurrections in the U. S.,* revd., 265-66.

Carter, Clarence E. (comp. & ed.), *Territorial Papers of U. S.,* VI, revd., 108-109.
Carter Glass: Unreconstructed Rebel, by James E. Palmer, revd., 408-409.
Caskey, Willie M., *Secession and Restoration of La.,* revd., 268-69.
Catholic church, enmity toward, in U. S., 266-67; attitude of S. P. G. toward, 486, 499-500.
Caughey, John W., *McGillivray of the Creeks,* revd., 106-107.
Cayton, Horace R. (co-auth.), *Black Workers and the New Unions,* revd., 567-68.
Census, Seventh, De Bow and, 73-74.
Chaffee, Calvin C., mentioned, 191.
Chamberlayne, John, Indian commissioner, 490 ff.
Champomier, P. A., sugar statistics, 316 ff.
Chase, Joshua C., mentioned, 573.
Chase, Salmon P., mentioned, 197.
Chattanooga, Univ. of, library acquisitions, 281.
Chemicals, lack of, effect on sugar industry, 318 ff.
Cherokee, hist. of, 107-108; removal and Jackson adm., 448 ff.; relig. work among, 480 ff.
Cheves, Langdon, mentioned, 463.
Chickasaw, relig. work among, 480 ff.
Child Labor Legislation in the Southern Textile States, by Elizabeth H. Davidson, revd., 407-408.
Chinn, Jack, mentioned, 34; trouble with Bronston, 41-42.
Christian Baptist, Campbell's, and educ., 31.
Chumbley, George L., *Col. Justice in Va.,* revd., 255-57.
Church-State Relationships in Education in North Carolina Since 1776, by Luther L. Gobbel, revd., 272-73.
Civil War, Fleming's writings on, 146 ff.; effect on land speculations, 158 ff.; causes, a Canadian view, 247 ff.; background as shown by Douglas, 529-52; a repressible conflict, 553-54.
Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama, by W. L. Fleming, appraised, 146-47, 150.
Clarendon, Lord, and Cuban question, 371 ff.
Clark, Blanche H., mentioned, 573.
Clark, Dan E., views on So. economy, 310.
Clark, George Rogers, and Rev. War, 105-106.
Clark, John B., revs. Owen's *Ala.,* 394.
Clark, Thomas D., "The People, William Goebel, and the Ky. R. Rs.," 34-48; *Rampaging Frontier,* revd., 398-99; mentioned, 412, 573.
Clarke, Charles, Canadian legislator, 245-46.
Clarke [Clark], John, and Ga. politics, 451 ff.
Clarke [Clark] party, and Jackson adm., 451 ff.
Clarkson, Thomas, biog., revd., 392-93.
Clay, Clement, supports homestead bills, 312.
Clay, Henry, and Bank fight, 397-98; influence on Ware, 512 ff.
Clayton, Augustine S., mentioned, 463.
Clingman, Thomas, and 1855-56 speakership contest, 190 ff.
Clinton, DeWitt, mentioned, 505.
Cloud, N. B., mentioned, 63.
Cobb, Howell, leader in 1855-56 speakership contest, 189 ff.; mentioned, 549.
Cobb, W. R. W., land speculator, 173; supports homestead bills, 312.
Coker, Francis W., mentioned, 414.
Cole, Fred C., mentioned, 74, 128; "Research Projects in So. Hist.," 581-86.
Coleman, J. Winston, Jr., *Lexington during the Civil War,* noted, 131.
Colfax, Schuyler, and 1855-56 speakership contest, 191 ff.
Colleges, frontier, 18 ff.
Colonial Justice in Virginia: The Development of a Judicial System, Typical Laws and Cases of the Period, by George L. Chumbley, revd., 255-57.
Colonial Records of North Carolina, pioneer publ., 10.
Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., research activity, 418.
Colonialism, as hist'l determinant, 334 ff.
Colson, D. G., and Ky. politics, 46.
Cometti, Elizabeth, mentioned, 412.
Compromise of 1850, Douglas views conc., 535 ff.
Concha, Jose de la, and Quitman filibuster, 381-82.
Confederacy, a Canadian view, 252-53; break-up and flight of officers, 269-70; division in, and Turner theory, 314; relations of Jefferson and Benjamin and, 468-78.
Confiscation, land, Civil War and, 181 ff.
Connor, R. D. W., first secy. of N. C. hist'l commission, 12.
Conservation, soil, in ante-bellum S. C., 71.
Constitution, U. S., proposed changes, 121-22; interpreted by Douglas, 529 ff.
"Constitution and By-Laws of the Southern Historical Association," 81-82.
Continental Congress, plan for reconciliation with Eng. and, 99-100.
"Contribution of Walter Lynwood Fleming to Southern Scholarship," by William C. Binkley, 143-54.

Cantrill, J. Campbell, leader in tobacco organization, 353 ff.
Cooke, Jay, promoter of Duluth, 166.
Coolies, plan to import, to La., 327.
"Copperheads," and Turner thesis, 314.
Corcoran, William W., land speculator, 164 ff.
Cordle, Charles G. (ed.), "The John Tobler MSS.: An Account of Ger.-Swiss Emigrants in S. C., 1737," 83-98.
Corporations, fight against, in Ky., 37 ff.; and Ky. tobacco industry, 347 ff.
Cotterill, R. S., revs. Caughey's *McGillivray of the Creeks,* 106-107; revs. Sonne's *Liberal* Ky., 393-94; *Short Hist. of the Americas,* noted, 575.
Cotton, kingdom, and Turner thesis, 299 ff.; culture, sugar substituted for, 315 ff.; plantation staple, 434 ff.; source of credit for Confed., 471 ff.; trade in, with Eng. advocated, 506.
Coulter, E. Merton, address noted, 68; (col. and ed.), *Other Half of Old New Orleans,* revd., 264-65; mentioned, 278, 574; revs. Macartney and Dorrance's *Bonapartes in Am.,* 557-58.
Covington, W. A., *Hist. of Colquitt County,* noted, 130-31.
Covode, John, mentioned, 191.
Craven, Avery, " 'Turner Theories' and the So.," 65, 291-314; mentioned, 278; *Repressible Conflict,* revd., 553-54.
Craven, Braxton, and Trinity College, 405-406.
Craven, Wesley F., *Intro. to the Hist. of Bermuda,* revd., 102-103; revs. Semmes' *Crime and Punishment in Early Md.,* 255-57; revs. Chumbley's *Col. Justice in Va.,* 255-57; mentioned, 278; revs. Forman's *Jamestown and St. Mary's,* 390-92.
Crawford, Joel, mentioned, 453.
Crawford, William H., and 1824 election, 396-97; and Berrien, 451 ff.
Credit system, ante-bellum La., and planting, 433 ff.
Creek, McGillivray and, 106-107; removal and Jackson adm., 448 ff.; S. P. G. work among, 480 ff.
Crime and Punishment in Early Maryland, by Raphael Semmes, revd., 255-57.
Crimean War, Anglo-Am. relations and, 371 ff.
Crittenden, C. C., mentioned, 72, 280.
Crowell, John F., *Personal Recollections,* revd., 405-407.
Cuba, annexation of, and U. S. diplomatic relations, 371 ff.; Douglas' views conc., 543-44, 550-51.
Cullen, Elisha D., mentioned, 191.
"Cultural Factors in the History of the South," by Richard H. Shryock, 333-46.
"Culture Versus Frontier in Tennessee, 1825-1850," by F. Garvin Davenport, 18-33.
Cumberland College, and Tenn. frontier, 19, 22; becomes Univ. of Nashville, 23.
Cumming, W. P., mentioned, 574.
Curry, J. L. M., Peabody fund gen. agent, 224 ff.
Curti, Merle E., mentioned, 275.
Cushing, Caleb, and Cuban annexation, 377.
"Cyrus Griffin's Plan of Reconciliation with the American Colonies," ed. by Henry S. Rorer, 98-101.

Dabney, Thomas, migration to Miss., 304; and frontier democracy, 308.
Dale, Edward E., revs. Coulter's (ed.), *Other Half of Old New Orleans,* 264-65; mentioned, 414.
Dallas Historical Society, acquisitions, 130.
Dallas *News,* hist., 270-72.
Danforth, James B., speculator in No. lands, 159-60, 179.
Dark Tobacco Association, and tobacco wars, 358 ff.
Dartmouth, Earl of, and Griffin peace plan, 98 ff.
Darwinian theory, and social theories, 338.
Dauer, Manning J., mentioned, 280.
Davenport, F. Garvin, "Culture vs. Frontier in Tenn.," 18-33; revs. Windrow's *John Berrien Lindsley,* 261-62.
Davidson, Elizabeth H., *Child Labor Legislation,* revd., 407-408.
Davidson, Philip, "The Fourth Ann. Meeting of the So. Hist'l Assoc.," 62-75; revs. Spruill's *Women's Life and Work in the So. Cols.,* 254-55; mentioned, 278.
Davis, Edwin A., revs. Hanna's *Flight into Oblivion,* 269-70; "Bennet H. Barrow, Ante-Bellum Planter of the Felicianas," 431-46.
Davis, Henry W., and 1855-56 speakership election, 190 ff.
Davis, Jefferson, Fleming's proposed study of, 151-52; mentioned, 246, 313, 540; and Cuban annexation, 377; relations with Benjamin, 468-78; criticized by Douglas, 537.
Davis, Mrs. Jefferson, influence with husband, 468; and Benjamin, 473-74.
Davis, Reuben, frontier creed of, 307; mentioned, 475.
Davis, Timothy, and 1855-56 speakership contest, 195.
Dawson, John C., *A French Regicide in Ala.,* revd., 558.
Day, Timothy C., views on 1855-56 speakership contest, 189.
Deas, Maj. George, land purchase, 166.

De Bow, J. D. B., and the Seventh Census, 73-74.
De Bow's Review, and sugar industry, 316 ff.
Degelos, P. A., sugar reports, 316.
Democracy, in Turner thesis, 295 ff.; as hist'l determinant, 333 ff.
Democracy in the Making: The Jackson-Tyler Era, by Hugh R. Fraser, revd., 397-98.
Democratic party, and Reconstruction, 51 ff.; 1860 campaign, 247 ff.; and 1855-56 speakership election, 187 ff.
Dennett, Daniel, ed. of *Planters' Banner,* 323.
Desmont, I., and Barrow, 435.
Determinants, hist'l, evaluation of, 333 ff.
Diamond, William, "Nathaniel A. Ware, Nat. Economist," 501-26.
Documentary History of Reconstruction, by W. L. Fleming, appraised, 147, 148-49, 150.
Dodd, William E., mentioned, 125.
Donelson, Andrew Jackson, mentioned, 459.
Doolittle, James R., and land speculations, 182.
Dorrance, Gordon (co-auth.), *Bonapartes in Am.,* revd., 557-58.
Douglas, Stephen A., and land speculations, 164, 166; influence in 1855-56 speakership election, 186 ff.; Montgomery address, 527-52.
Douglass, Frederick, favors slave insurrection, 221.
Downs, Robert B. (ed.), *Resources of So. Libraries,* noted, 130.
Drake, Julia A. (co-auth.), *From Mill Wheel to Plowshare,* revd., 556-57.
Drayton, William, mentioned, 451.
Dred Scott case, and slave insurrections, 206.
Driver, Carl, mentioned, 153.
Driver, Leota S., revs. Armstrong's *Fanny Kemble,* 110-12.
Du Bois, W. E. B., and Reconstruction hist., 52; *Black Folk,* revd., 564-65.
Duke, Basil W., lobbyist for L. and N. R. R., 40.
Dulany, Martin R., work on Negro hist., 59.
Dumond, Dwight L., mentioned, 124; (ed.), *Letters of James G. Birney,* revd., 263-64.
Duncan, Dr. Stephen, land speculator, 178.
Duniway, David C., revs. Kohn and Glenn's (eds.) *Internal Improvement in S. C.,* 395-96.
Dunning, William A., on the Negro, 59; influence on Fleming, 145.
Dunton, L. M., pres. of Claflin Univ., 240.
Dupre, John H., mentioned, 276, 412.
Dykstra, Charles, mentioned, 574.
Early Description of Middle Tennessee, by E. Bushnell, ed. by Douglas C. McMurtrie, noted, 418.
Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner, comp. by Everett E. Edwards, revd., 387-89.
Easley, Daniel B., land speculator, 163.
Easley, James S., land speculator, 161-63, 179, 180.
Easley and Willingham, land speculators, 161-63.
East Tennessee Historical Society, ann. banquet, noted, 127; ann. meeting, noted, 277; to publ. studies, 281.
Eaton, Clement, wins Duke Press prize, 275.
Eaton, John H., and Jackson adm., 448 ff.
Eaton Affair, and Jackson cabinet, 455 ff.
Eckenrode, H. J., mentioned, 471.
Economic development, as hist'l determinant, 333 ff.
Education, frontier, in early Tenn., 19 ff.; Negro, Slater fund work, 223-45; church-state relations in, 272-73; in Ware's writings, 520 ff.
Edwards, Everett E., "The So. Plantation," noted, 63; mentioned, 276; (comp.), *Early Writings of Frederick J. Turner,* revd., 387-89; bibliog. compilations, noted, 575-76.
"Effects of the Civil War on the Louisiana Sugar Industry," by Walter Prichard, 315-32.
Election laws, Ky., 38 ff.
Eliot, Thomas D., and So. land speculators, 182.
Ellis, Elmer, mentioned, 413.
Ellison, William H., revs. Stern's *Man Who Killed Lincoln,* 401-402.
Ellsworth, Henry L., land speculator, 157.
Elmore, Rush, land speculator, 172.
Ely, Richard T., collection, acquired by L. S. U., 129.
Emigrants, Ger.-Swiss, in S. C., 83-97; in La., 325 ff.
English, views of American culture, 334 ff.; in U. S., 341-44; attitude toward U. S. annexation of Cuba, 371 ff.; diplomatic relations with U. S., 372 ff.; and Confed., 471 ff.
English, William H., mentioned, 190.
Equity, Soc. of, in Ky., 347-63.
Evans, Mona, mentioned, 413.
Evarts, William M., Peabody Trustee, 224.
Everett, Edward, mentioned, 505.
Ewing, Felix G., and tobacco planters organization, 351 ff.
Ewing, Thomas, and land speculations, 169.
Ewing, Thomas, Jr., land agent, 164.

Factors, and La. sugar industry, 319.

Fanny Kemble: A Passionate Victorian, by Margaret Armstrong, revd., 110-12.
Fanshawe, Arthur, and Cuban question, 380-81.
Fant, E. L., land speculator, 164, 179.
Farish, Hunter D., mentioned, 124.
Felicianas, planting and soc. life, 431-46.
Ferguson, McDougal, mentioned, 47.
Fertilizer, use of, in Reconstruction period, 54; ante-bellum use, 71; commercial, use in sugar planting, 328; use on La. plantation, 437-38.
Ficklin, Orlando B., land purchases, 166.
Filson Club, newspaper acquisitions, 420.
Finley, Robert, mentioned, 18.
Finley and Company, N. O. factors, 434.
"First Northern Victory," by Fred H. Harrington, 186-205.
Fitzhugh, George, biog., noted, 279.
Fleming, Walter L., contribution to So. scholarship, 74, 143-54.
Fleming Lectures, third series, noted, 175; second series, revd., 533-34.
Flight into Oblivion, by A. J. Hanna, revd., 269-70.
Florida, preservation of hist'l records, 8; lacks archival agency, 13; slave insurrection plots, 218.
Florida Historical Society, meetings noted, 126-27, 277-78, 416-17.
Flournoy, L. M., land speculator, 171.
Floyd, John B., land speculator, 175.
Foerster, Norman, mentioned, 275.
Folmsbee, Stanley J., mentioned, 281.
Fordyce, John, S. P. G. missionary, 497.
Forman, Henry C., *Jamestown and St. Mary's, Buried Cities of Romance,* revd., 390-92.
Forney, John, and land speculation, 164-166.
Forsyth, John, and Ga. politics, 453.
Fort Sumter, a Canadian view of attack on, 253.
Fortier, James J. A., mentioned, 72.
Forty Acres and Steel Mules, by Herman C. Nixon, revd., 568-70.
"Fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Historical Association," by Philip Davidson, 62-75.
Fowler, Harold L., mentioned, 125.
France, alliance with Eng. and Cuban question, 371 ff.
Franklin, "Bob," and "Music Hall" convention, 42.
Franklin, Isaac, study of, revd., 109-110.
Franklin, W. Neil, elected to board of eds., 77; revs. Brown's *Old Frontiers,* 107-108.
Fraser, Hugh R., *Democracy in the Making,* revd., 397-98.
Free Soilers, and 1855-56 speakership election, 187 ff.
Freedmen, Fleming's writings about, 149 ff. *See also* Negro.
Freedmen's Aid Society, school in Tenn., 235; in La., 237.
Freedmen's Bureau, and Reconstruction, 52-53; and La. sugar industry, 323 ff.
Freeman, Douglas S., gives Dancy Foundation Lectures, 415.
Freeport Doctrine, Douglas' interpretation of, 549.
Frémont, John C., nomination viewed with alarm, 207.
French Regicide in Alabama, 1824-1837, by John C. Dawson, revd., 558.
French Revolution, hist., compared with Reconstruction, 51.
From Mill Wheel to Plowshare: The Story of the Contribution of the Christian Orndorff Family to the Social and Industrial History of the U. S., by Julia Angeline Drake and James R. Orndorff, revd., 556-57.
Frontier, culture vs., in Tenn., 18-33; Turner thesis of, discussed, 65-66, 291-314, 563; manners and humors, 398-99; S. C., religious work, 480 ff.
Fugitive Slave law, issue in 1855-56 speakership contest, 199 ff.; Douglas' attitude toward, 531 ff.
Fuller, Henry M., and 1855-56 speakership contest, 190 ff.
"Future Regions of the United States," by Harry E. Moore, synop., 69-70.

Gabriel, slave insurrection leader, 206.
Gaines, John W., supports farmers' organization, 352.
Gallagher, Buell G., *Am. Caste and the Negro College,* revd., 273-74.
Gallatin, Albert, mentioned, 463.
Garden, Alexander, S. P. G. missionary, 498.
Gardner, Malcolm E., "The Natchez Trace as an Historic Site Problem," synop., 64-65.
Garner, Alfred W., mentioned, 279.
Garrison, Curtis W., mentioned, 279, 415; "Slater Fund Beginnings," 223-45; revs. Bond's *Negro Educ. in Ala.,* 404-405.
Garrison, William L., and 1855-56 speakership contest, 205; Phillips' opinion of, 366.
Gates, Paul W., "So. Investments in No. Lands before the Civil War," 155-85.
General W. T. Sherman as College President, by W. L. Fleming, noted, 150.
Gentleman of the Old Natchez Region: Benjamin L. C. Wailes, by Charles S. Sydnor, revd., 114-15.
Geography, and regionalism, 69-70; as hist'l determinant, 333 ff.
Geology, theory and practice in So., 70-71.

George Fitzhugh, Conservative of the Old South, by Harvey Wish, noted, 279.
George W. Truett, by Powhatan W. James, revd., 410.
Georgia, preservation of hist'l records, 7-8; Compiler of State Records, established, 12; slave insurrection plots, 218-19; Slater fund work in, 226 ff.; emigration from, 300 ff.; frontier life, 306; supports Jackson adm., 447 ff.
Georgia Historical Society, centennial celebration, 416.
German, element, and frontier development, 295, 298; immigration to La., 326; in U. S., 341-44.
German-Swiss, S. C. emigrants, 83-98.
Giddings, Franklin H., mentioned, 145.
Giddings, Joshua, and 1855-56 speakership contest, 186 ff.
Giessendanner, John, Ger.-Swiss emigrant to S. C., 86 ff.
Gilbert, Dorothy L., *Guilford, A Quaker College,* noted, 575.
Gillespie, J. C., mentioned, 39.
Gilman, Daniel C., controversies with Haygood, 225 ff.; and Negro educ., 229-31.
Gilmer, George R., and Jacksonian politics, 449 ff.
Gilmore, John R., peace agent, 476.
Glass, Carter, mentioned, 50; biog., revd., 408-409.
Glassie, Henry H., mentioned, 78.
Glenn, Bess (co-ed.), *Internal Improvement in S. C.,* revd., 395-96.
Gobbel, Luther L., *Church-State Relationships in Educ. in N. C. Since 1776,* revd., 272-73.
Gobineau, Arthur de, mentioned, 338.
Godman, W. S., and Slater fund work, 241.
Goebel, William, and Ky. R. Rs., 34-38; murdered, 34; campaign for gov., 34 ff.
Goff, John H., mentioned, 414.
Govan, Thomas P., "John M. Berrien and the Adm. of Andrew Jackson," 447-67; mentioned, 573.
Government records, preservation, 5 ff.
Grady, Henry W., mentioned, 50; and educ. work, 242.
Graham, Dr. Alexander, and land speculation, 174-75.
Grant, Ulysses S., 1864-65 mil. campaigns, 400-401.
Grayson, William J., views on land speculation, 156.
Greeley, Horace, mentioned, 188; and 1855-56 speakership contest, 195.
Green, Duff, and Eaton Affair, 458 ff.
Green, Fletcher M., "Annual Rpt. of the Secy.-Treas.," 76-80; mentioned, 146, 276, 573; revs. Fraser's *Dem. in the Making,* 397-98.
Greensboro Historical Museum, opening announced, 418.
Gregorie, Anne K., rpt. on S. C. hist'l agencies, synop., 73.
Griffin, Cyrus, reconciliation plan, 98-101.
Griffith, Dr. Hamilton, land speculator, 183-84.
Griggs, Earl L., *Thomas Clarkson,* revd., 392-93.
Grover, A. J., abolitionist, 221.
Grow, Galusha A., mentioned, 191.
Guenther, J. Ed, and L. and N. R. R., 48.
Guilford, A Quaker College, by Dorothy L. Gilbert, noted, 575.

Habersham, Richard W., letter to Berrien, 460-61, 462.
Hale, Oron J., mentioned, 276.
Hall, Arthur R., discusses soil conservation in S. C., 71.
Hall, Ellery L., mentioned, 413.
Halsey, Edwin G., land speculator, 177.
Hamer, Philip M., "The Records of So. Hist.," 3-17; pres. address, noted, 72; mentioned, 278.
Hamilton, A., of Ky., land speculator, 160.
Hamilton, Alexander, influence on U. S. pol. econ., 501 ff.
Hamilton, George H., and land speculation, 160.
Hamilton, Hugh L., *A Second Cons. for the U. S.,* revd., 121-22.
Hamilton, J. G. de R., mentioned, 73.
Hamilton, James, Jr., mentioned, 451.
Hamilton, James C., and land speculation, 160.
Hamilton, William B., mentioned, 279.
Hampton, Wade, land speculator, 158.
Handbook of Oklahoma Writers, by Mary H. Marable and Elaine Boylan, revd., 389-90.
Hanna, A. J., mentioned, 77; *Flight into Oblivion,* revd., 269-70.
Hanscom, S. P., lobbiest, 195.
Harbison, William, and brothers, land speculators, 179.
Hardin, P. Wat, and Ky. politics, 36 ff.
Harper's Ferry, plot, forerunner of Brown's raid, 220.
Harrington, Fred H., "The First No. Victory," 186-205.
Harris, Robert J., ed. *Journal of Politics,* 280.
Harris, Rufus C., mentioned, 72.
Harrison, Benjamin, mentioned, 242-43.
Harrison, John S., and 1855-56 speakership contest, 191, 195.
Hartford Convention, cited as beginning of abolitionism, 532-33.
Harvey Belden, by Nathaniel Ware, discussed, 510.

Hasell, Thomas, S. P. G. missionary, 493, 494-95.
Haven, Solomon G., and 1855-56 speakership election, 187.
Hay, Thomas R., revs. Burne's *Lee, Grant and Sherman,* 400-401.
Hayes, Rutherford B., and Slater fund work, 223-45.
Hayes Memorial Library, ann. rpt., 1937-38, noted, 279; grants-in-aid, 415.
Haygood, Atticus G., and Slater fund work, 223-45.
Hayne, Robert Y., mentioned, 451.
Haynes, Thomas, candidate for Ga. gov., 461.
Hege, Josephine, mentioned, 412.
Helderman, Leonard C., mentioned, 276.
Helm, James P., mentioned, 44.
Henderson, Gavin B. (ed.), "So. Designs on Cuba," 371-85.
Herbert, Philemon T., mentioned, 191.
Herndon, Dallas T., *Ark. Handbook, 1937-1938,* noted, 131.
Higgins, Joel, land speculator, 167.
Higgins, Richard, land speculator, 167.
Hill, Lawrence F., mentioned, 276.
Hill, Roscoe R., mentioned, 413, 414.
"Hillbilly," and tobacco wars, 355 ff.
Historic Sites Act, discussed, 64.
Historical records, preservation, 3-17; laws conserving, 9 ff.
Historical Records Survey, publications noted, 131, 419; appointments, 413.
Historical research, aids to, subject of discussion, 66, 72-73.
Historical Scholarship in the United States, 1876-1901, ed. by W. Stull Holt, revd., 561-62.
Historical sociology, identification, 333.
History of Colquitt County, by W. A. Covington, noted, 130-31.
History of History, by James T. Shotwell, revd., 386-87.
History of Louisiana State University, by W. L. Fleming, noted, 151.
History of the South, co-op. 10 volume, announced, 278.
Hodges, Charles, mentioned, 413.
Hoey, Clyde R., mentioned, 418.
Hogan, William R., mentioned, 64.
Holcombe, Arthur N., mentioned, 414-15.
Holderness, W. H., views on Cuban filibuster, 375-76.
Holmes, Alester G., revs. Taylor and McDavid's (eds.) *Memoirs of Richard Cannon Watts,* 120-21.
Holt, John D., land speculator, 163.
Holt, W. Stull, revs. Edwards' *Early Writings of Frederick Turner,* 387-89; (ed.) *Hist'l Scholarship in the U. S.,* revd., 561-62.
Homestead legislation, supported by Southerners, 312.
Horn, Stanley F., *Invisible Empire,* revd., 402-404.
House, Albert V., Jr., "The So. and No. Democratic Cong. Leaders during Reconstruction and After," synop., 67-68.
Houston, Sam, writings of, revd., 259-61.
Howard, William E., collection given to Dallas Hist'l Soc., 130.
Howden, Lord, views on Anglo-Am. relations, 376 ff.
Humphrey, Samuel P., land speculator, 167.
Hunt, Brian, and Indian relig. work, 496.
Hunt, Francis K., land speculator, 171.
Hunt, William G., views on Tenn. culture, 24.
Hunter, Charles E., mentioned, 124.
Hunter, R. M. T., land speculator, 164-66.
Hurley, Michael, land speculator, 177.
Hurley, William, land speculator, 177, 184.
Hyams, Henry M., ed. *Sugar Planter,* 323.

Illinois, land speculation in, 156 ff.
Immigration, into S. C., 83-98; attempts to encourage, to La., 326-27.
Implements, agric., and sugar industry, 318, 328 ff.
In Memoriam: William Kenneth Boyd, January 10, 1879-January 19, 1938, noted, 280.
"Indian Frontier in South Carolina as Seen by the S. P. G. Missionary," by Frank J. Klingberg, 479-500.
Indiana, land speculation in, 156.
Indians, and Turner thesis, 297, 301 ff.; policy of Jackson adm. toward, 447 ff.; S. P. G. missionaries among, 479-500; S. C., as viewed by Ger.-Swiss emigrants, 95 ff.
Ingham, Samuel D., and Jackson adm., 454 ff.
Insurrection, slave, panic of 1856, pp. 206-22; vol. on, 265-66.
Internal Improvement in South Carolina, 1817-1828, ed. by David Kohn and Bess Glenn, revd., 395-96.
Internal improvements, Ky., conflict over, 35 ff.; as discussed in Ware's pol. econ., 518 ff.; S. C., 395-96; La. levee system, 329-30.
Introduction to the History of Bermuda, by Wesley F. Craven, revd., 102-103.
Investments, So., in No. lands, 155-85.
Invisible Empire: The Story of the Ku Klux Klan, 1866-1871, by Stanley F. Horn, revd., 402-404.
Iowa, land speculation in, 156 ff.
Irish, emigration to La., 326.
Iron manufacture, and slave worker's plot, 210-12.

Irvine, Dallas, mentioned, 77.
Isaac Franklin, Slave Trader and Planter of the Old South, by Wendell H. Stephenson, revd., 109-10.
Ittiwan, religious work among, 480 ff.

Jackson, Andrew, mentioned, 297, 302, 523; political policy, 397-98; relations with Berrien, 447-67.
Jackson, "Stonewall," Benjamin's removal of, 473.
Jacksonville Historical Society, meeting noted, 416-17.
James, Powhatan W., *George W. Truett,* revd., 410.
James Madison: Philosopher of the Constitution, by Edward M. Burns, revd., 258-59.
Jamestown, project at, explained, 572.
Jamestown and St. Mary's, Buried Cities of Romance, by Henry C. Forman, revd., 390-92.
Jaquess, James, peace agent, 476.
Jay, John, diplomacy of, and West, 105-106.
Jefferson, Thomas, mentioned, 297; statesmanship criticized, 523 ff.
Jennings, Obadiah, debate with Campbell, 32-33.
Jesup, Morris K., controversies with Haygood, 223 ff.
John Berrien Lindsley: Educator, Physician, Social Philosopher, by John E. Windrow, revd., 261-62.
"John M. Berrien and the Administration of Andrew Jackson," by Thomas P. Govan, 447-67.
"John Tobler Manuscripts: An Account of German-Swiss Emigrants in South Carolina, 1737," ed. by Charles G. Cordle, 83-97.
Johnson, Cary, mentioned, 125.
Johnson, Gerald W., mentioned, 414.
Johnson, Richard M., mentioned, 458 ff.
Johnson, William, and Indian religious work, 488.
Johnston, Frontis W., mentioned, 574.
Johnston, Gideon, S. P. G. commissary, 483 ff.
Johnston, Joseph E., mentioned, 418; relations with Benjamin, 473, 474-75.
Jones, Dorsey D., mentioned, 412.
Jones, George W., mentioned, 190.
Jones, W. H., mentioned, 39.
Jordon, W. T., mentioned, 276.
Journal of Mississippi History, announced, 279.
Journal of Politics, announced, 280.
Journal of the History of Ideas, announced, 419.
Kansas, settlement, as political issue, 187 ff.; and slave question, 206; conflict over slavery, 299-300.
Kansas-Nebraska Act, and 1855-56 speakership election, 186 ff.; Douglas' views conc., 538 ff.
Kegley, B. F., *Kegley's Va. Frontier,* revd., 103-104.
Kegley's Virginia Frontier; the Beginning of the Southwest; the Roanoke of Colonial Days, by B. F. Kegley, revd., 103-104.
Kellar, Herbert A., program work commended, 76-77; revs. Sydnor's *Benjamin L. C. Wailes,* 114-15; delivers Fleming Lectures, 275; reminiscence of Phillips, noted, 367; revs. Drake and Orndorff's *From Mill Wheel to Plowshare,* 556-57.
Kelly, John, mentioned, 190.
Kemble, Fanny, biog. of, revd., 110-12.
Kendrick, Benjamin B., discusses Turner paper, 66; revs. Du Bois' *Black Folk,* 564-65.
Kenner, Duncan, Br. mission, 476.
Kentucky, preservation of hist'l records, 6, 8; archives dept., 12; R. Rs., Goebel and, 34-48; in Reconstruction, 35; cons., 35-36; slave insurrection panic, 209-15, 222; Am. Soc. of Equity in, 347-63; liberalism in, 393-94.
Kentucky, Univ. of, library acquisitions, 282.
Key, Francis Scott, and Jackson adm., 455-56.
King, Rufus, and Mo. question, 533.
King, William M., land speculator, 179.
Kinney, John F., land speculator, 173.
Klingberg, Frank J., *Old Sherry,* revd., 119-20; "The Indian Frontier in S. C.," 479-500.
Knott, Richard, mentioned, 44.
Know Nothings, and 1855-56 speakership election, 187 ff.; 1860 campaign, 247; hist., 266-67.
Kohlmeier, A. L., *Old Northwest,* revd., 112-13.
Kohn, David (co-ed.), *Internal Improvements in S. C.,* revd., 395-96.
Ku Klux Klan, history, misrepresentation of, 50; study of, revd., 402-404.
Kuhlman, A. F., "Collection, Organization, and Preservation of Hist'l Source Materials," synop., 72.

Lacy, Dan, mentioned, 413.
Lafourche, Bayou, sugar planting on, 313 ff.
LaFuze, Leighton, mentioned, 125.
Lakanal, Joseph, French regicide in U. S., 558.

Land, public, Tenn. laws conc., 25 ff.; legislation, and Turner thesis, 297; speculation in, 155-85, 307-308; value, decrease after Civil War, 321 ff.
Landlord, Ky., and tobacco wars, 349 ff.
Landon, Fred, "Ulrich Bonnell Phillips: Historian of the So.," 74, 364-71.
Lane, James H., mentioned, 177.
Langsam, Walter C., mentioned, 276.
Lanning, John T., mentioned, 414.
Lathrop, Barnes F., discusses microfilming, 66.
Lattimer, David W., mentioned, 125.
Lawson McGhee Library, acquisitions, 421.
Lea, Isaac, mentioned, 505.
Leavens, Joshua B., land speculator, 178.
LeBus, Clarence, pres. Burley Tobacco Soc., 353 ff.
Ledoux, A., and Co., N. O. factors, 434.
Lee, Robert E., 1864-65 campaigns, 400-401.
Lee, Ronald F., "Objectives and Policies in the Conservation of Historic Sites," synop., 64; communication, 572.
Lee, Grant and Sherman: A Study in Leadership in the 1864-65 Campaign, by Alfred H. Burne, revd., 400-401.
Leigh, Thomas, land speculator, 163.
Le Jau, Francis, relig. work in col. S. C., 480 ff.
Leland, Edwin A., mentioned, 76.
Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1831-1857, ed. by Dwight L. Dumond, revd., 263-64.
Levees, and La. sugar industry, 329-30.
Lexington during the Civil War, by J. Winston Coleman, Jr., noted, 131.
Liberal Kentucky, 1780-1828, by Niels H. Sonne, revd., 393-94.
Liberia, causes of failure, 59-60.
Library of Congress, preservation of hist'l records, 13; acquisitions, 129.
Life and Labor in the Old South, by U. B. Phillips, discussed, 367, 369.
Lillard, Eph, mentioned, 34.
Lincecum, Gideon, migrations to So. Wests, 303-304.
Lincoln, Abraham, as viewed by Canadian, 248 ff; candidacy attacked by Douglas, 527 ff.; study of assassin, revd., 401-402.
Lindsley, John Berrien, biog., revd., 261-62.
Lindsley, Philip, pres. Univ. of Nashville, career, 18 ff.; and Tenn. frontier culture, 19 ff.; mentioned, 262.
List, Friedrich, mentioned, 512.
Literature, frontier habits and, 21 ff.
Livestock, Civil War losses, and sugar industry, 318 ff.
Livingood, James W., revs. McFerrin's *Caldwell and Co.,* 570-71.
Livingston, Edward, mentioned, 455.
Livingstone, David, mentioned, 485.
Lockmiller, David A., mentioned, 412.
Lohrer, Jane, mentioned, 412.
Longstreet, Augustus B., mentioned, 463.
Lonn, Ella, revs. Caskey's *Secession and Restoration of La.,* 268-69.
Loose, Joseph B., land speculator, 166-67.
Loughborough, Preston S., land speculator, 169.
Louisiana, archival agency, 12; sugar industry, 63-64, 315 ff.; Hist'l Records Survey work, 131, 419 ff.; capital invested in No. lands, 156 ff.; slave insurrection panic, 217-18; Slater fund work, 228 ff.; secession and restoration, 268-69; purchase and Cons., 294; cattle days, 302-303; plantation life, 431-46.
Louisiana State University, acquires Ely Collection, 129; Fleming and, 151 ff.; Dept. of Archives and Hist., acquisitions, 422.
Louisville and Nashville Railroad, and Ky. politics, 37 ff.
Lowenberg, Burt J., mentioned, 276.
Ludham, Richard, S. P. G. missionary, 498.
Lumpkin, Wilson, and Jackson adm., 461.

Macartney, Clarence E., (co-auth.), *Bonapartes in Am.,* revd., 557-58.
McCain, William D., ed. of Miss. hist'l jour., 279.
McChord, Charles C., and Ky. R. R. bill, 38 ff.
McConnell, Andrew, mentioned, 48.
McConnell, Felix, supports homestead bills, 312.
McCordock, Robert S., *Yankee Cheese Box,* revd., 117-18.
McDavid, Raven I. (co-ed.), *Memoirs of Richard C. Watts,* revd., 120-21.
McDonald, Hunter, mentioned, 79.
McDuffie, George, mentioned, 451.
McFadyen, Christiana, mentioned, 412.
McFarland, John, land speculator, 167.
McFerrin, John B., *Caldwell and Co.,* revd., 570-71.
McGeachy, J. A., mentioned, 574.
McGee, Thomas D'Arcy, mentioned, 250.
McGillivray of the Creeks, by John W. Caughey, revd., 106-107.
McGready, James, mentioned, 27.
McKinley, William, mentioned, 38.
McLane, Louis, mentioned, 452.
McLemore, R. A., mentioned, 279.
McMillan, George W., organizes tobacco farmers, 353.
McMullen, Fayette, threatens secession, 205.
McMurtrie, Douglas C., discusses Am. Imprints Survey, 71; mentioned, 418.

McSwain, H. E., supports "Equity idea," 352 ff.
Madison, James, biog., revd., 258-59.
Mahone, William, unpopularity in So., 243.
Malhiot, E. E., land speculator, 158-59, 183.
Malin, James C., mentioned, 124.
Malthus, Thomas, influence on nat. economists, 501 ff.
Man Who Killed Lincoln, by Philip Van Doren Stern, revd., 401-402.
Manchester, Alan K., mentioned, 414.
Mann, Dudley, and Ostend Manifesto, 373 ff.
Manufacture, sugar, effect of Civil War on, 315 ff.; home, on La. plantation, 435 ff.
Marable, Mary H. (co-auth.), *Handbook of Okla. Writers,* revd., 389-90.
Marcy, William L., and Ostend Manifesto, 373-74.
Marshall, Humphrey, views on Neb. bill, 188; speakership candidate, 191 ff.
Martineau, Harriet, views on Ger. settlers, 342-43.
Maryland, Hall of Records, 12; slave insurrection plots, 219; crime and punishment in early, 255-57.
Mason, George, mentioned, 531.
Massachusetts, and Griffin's peace plan, 99-100.
Massey, Maria M., mentioned, 125.
Mather, John, land speculator, 175.
Maule, Robert, S. P. G. missionary, 481 ff.
Meade, Robert D., mentioned, 77, 573; "Relations Between Benjamin and Davis," 468-78.
"Medical Theory and Practice in the Confederacy," by George Adams, synop., 70.
Medicine, frontier practice, 21 ff.
Memoirs of Richard Cannon Watts, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of South Carolina, 1927-1930, ed. by Rosser H. Taylor and Raven I. McDavid, revd., 120-21.
Memphis, hist. of, revd., 554-55.
Mendenhall, Marjorie, paper on James H. Hammond, planter, synop., 63.
Mercer, Charles F., erroneously credited with vol., 508-509.
Merrimac, hist. of, 117-18.
Methodists, and Tenn. culture, 27 ff.; and Slater fund work, 226 ff.; and Trinity College, 405-407.
Mexicans, and slave plots, 208.
Michigan, land speculation in, 156 ff.
Microfilming, work on So. materials, 66.
Millechamp, Timothy, S. P. G. missionary, 497.
Milling industry, development, 556-57.
Missionaries, S. P. G., on S. C. frontier, 479-500.
Mississippi, preservation of hist'l records, 7, 8; hist'l commission, 11; Negro in, 58-59; territorial papers, 108-109; land speculation, 156; slave insurrection panic, 218; Slater fund work, 232 ff.; emigration to, 301 ff.; and Indian question, 447.
Mississippi Department of Archives and History, established, 11; compilations, 127; acquisitions, 129, 420, 575.
Mississippi River, sugar planting on, 315 ff.
Mississippi Valley Historical Association, ann. meeting noted, 415-16.
Missouri, land speculation in, 156 ff.; slave insurrection panic, 215-16.
Missouri Compromise, Douglas' view conc., 532 ff.
Mitchell, Dr. C. B., land purchases, 166.
Mitchell, George S. (co-auth.), *Black Workers and the New Unions,* revd., 567-68.
Moffitt, James W., revs. Marable and Boylan's *A Handbook of Okla. Writers,* 389-90.
Moger, Allen W., revs. Palmer's *Carter Glass,* 408-409.
Monitor, influence on Civil War, 117.
Monroe, James, mentioned, 297; and So. Indian question, 448.
Montague, Ludwell L., mentioned, 276.
"Montgomery Address of Stephen A. Douglas," ed. by David R. Barbee and Milledge L. Bonham, Jr., 527-52.
Moody, V. Alton, "No. Trade with So. in the Ante-Bellum Period," synop., 67; mentioned, 276.
Mooney, Chase, mentioned, 276, 574.
Moore, Albert B., revs. Nixon's *Forty Acres and Steel Mules,* 568-70.
Moore, Harry E., "Future Regions of the U. S.," synop., 69-70.
Moore, Ike, mentioned, 413.
Moore, Ross H., mentioned, 125, 279.
Moorehead, Paul G., mentioned, 276.
Morrill, Justin S., mentioned, 191.
Morritt, Thomas, S. P. G. missionary, 496-97.
Morton, Richard L., revs. Bean's *Peopling of Va.,* 257-58.
Morton, Samuel B., mentioned, 338.
Mott, Richard, mentioned, 191.
Mowry, George E., mentioned, 125.
Museum, Nashville, established, 22.

Nairne, Thomas, Indian agent in S. C., 486-88.
Napier, Lord, and Cuban question, 383-84.
Napoleon, Louis, relations with Confed., 475-76.
Nashville, cultural development, 19 ff.; conv., and So. rights, 535.

Nashville Female Academy, mentioned, 22.
Natchez, frontier life in, 305-306.
"Natchez Trace as an Historic Site Problem," by Malcolm E. Gardner, synop., 64-65.
"Nathaniel A. Ware, National Economist," by William Diamond, 501-26.
National Archives, preservation of hist'l records, 13 ff.; acquisitions, 130, 282, 421-22.
National economy, school of political econ., 501-26.
National Park Service, preserves hist'l sites, 13; activities discussed, 64-65.
Nationalism, in relation to Turner thesis, 295 ff.; as a hist'l determinant, 333 ff.
Nativism, American, origins, 266-67.
Naudain, Arnold, land speculator, 169.
Nebraska, settlement, as political issue, 188 ff.
Negro, in Reconstruction, new viewpoints, 49 ff.; inferiority of, discussed, 69; Fleming's writings about, 149 ff.; free, and slave insurrections, 211 ff.; Slater fund work, 224 ff.; educ., 224 ff., 273-74; and Turner thesis, 299 ff.; free, and sugar industry, 323 ff.; and hist'l determinants, 337; Phillips' writings about, 368-69; labor legislation and, 408; hist. and sociology, 564-65; hist. of, in U. S., 565-66; as laborers, 567-69. *See also* Slavery.
Negro Education in Alabama: A Study in Cotton and Steel, by Horace Mann Bond, revd., 404-405.
Negro in Brazil, by Arthur Ramos, trans. by Richard Pattie, noted, 575.
New Deal, rev. of book relative to, 568-70.
New Mexico, Douglas and territory of, 534-35, 547.
New Orleans, humorous sketches, 264-65; trade, 305.
New Orleans *Price-Current,* sugar statistics, 316 ff.
"New Viewpoints of Southern Reconstruction," by Francis B. Simkins, 49-61.
Newman, A. H., mentioned, 29.
Newsome, Albert R., *Pres. Election of 1824 in N. C.,* revd., 396-97; revs. Holt's (ed.) *Hist'l Scholarship in the U. S.,* 561-62.
Newspapers, and 1855-56 speakership contest, 188 ff.; and slave insurrections, 207 ff.; and 1860-61 parties and issues, 246 ff.; sugar statistics, 316 ff.; and Eaton affair, 457 ff.; Ala., and Douglas, 529.
"Night Riding," and Ky. tobacco wars, 347 ff.
Niles, Hezekiah, nat. economist, 501 ff.
Nixon, H. C., mentioned, 413; revs. Cayton and Mitchell's (co-auths.) *Black Workers and the New Unions,* 567-68; *Forty Acres and Steel Mules,* revd., 568-70.
North Carolina, preservation of hist'l records, 6, 10; Hist'l Commission, 12; Hist'l Records survey work, 131; interest in Slater fund work, 227 ff.; church-state relations in educ., 272-73; emigration from, 300 ff.; 1824 pres. election in, 396-97; educ., 405-407.
North Carolina, Univ. of, library acquisitions, 419.
North Carolina Historical Commission, acquisitions, 417-18.
North Carolina State Literary and Historical Association, ann. meeting, 128.
Northrop, Lucius B., mentioned, 469.
Northwest, Old, commerce and politics, 112-13.
Notes on Political Economy, by Nathaniel Ware, discussed, 508, 522 ff.
Nullification, S. C., effect on Ga. politics, 464 ff.

Odum, Howard W., mentioned, 414.
Ohio, land speculation in, 156 ff.
Ohio River, Shelburne's plans to secure, 105-106.
Oklahoma, handbook of writers, 389-90.
Oklahoma Hist'l Soc., early work, 13; acquisitions, 130, 282, 575; ann. meeting, noted, 416.
Old Frontiers: The Story of the Cherokee Indians, by John P. Brown, revd., 107-108.
Old Northwest as the Keystone of the Arch of American Federal Union: A Study in Commerce and Politics, by A. L. Kohlmeier, revd., 112-13.
Old Sherry: Portrait of a Virginia Family, by Frank J. Klingberg, revd., 119-20.
"Old West," by Frederick J. Turner, noted, 297 ff.
Opelousas region, sugar planting in, 315 ff.
Orndorff, James R. (co-auth.), *From Mill Wheel to Plowshare,* revd., 556-57.
Orndorff family, hist. of, revd., 556-57.
Orr, William, S. P. G. missionary, 497.
Osburn, Nathaniel, S. P. G. missionary, 494.
Osgood, Herbert L., mentioned, 145.
Other Half of Old New Orleans, col. and ed. by E. Merton Coulter, revd., 264-65.
Ott, Edward, revs. Bolton's *Wider Horizons of Am. Hist.,* 563-64.
Our First Great West in Revolutionary War, Diplomacy and Politics, by Temple Bodley, revd., 105-106.

Overdyke, W. Darrell, revs. Billington's *Protestant Crusade,* 266-67.
Owen, Marie B., *Ala.,* revd., 394.
Owen, Thomas M., Ala. archivist, 10-11.
Owens, Thomas E., land speculator, 163.
Owsley, Frank L., "Population Structure of the Late Ante-Bellum South," synop., 69; mentioned, 78, 276; revs. Dumond's (ed.) *Letters of James G. Birney,* 263-64.

Pace, Jerman W., land speculator, 177.
Pairo and Nourse, land speculators, 163-64.
Palmer, James E., *Carter Glass,* revd., 408-409.
Palmerston, Lord, and Cuban question, 375 ff.
Panic of 1857, effect on land speculation, 163 ff.
Parker, Daniel, and Tenn. culture, 31.
Parks, Edd W., *Segments of So. Thought,* revd., 558-60.
Parsons, Edward A., address noted, 68.
Patrick, Rembert W., mentioned, 412.
Pattie, Richard (trans.), Arthur Ramos, *Negro in Brazil,* noted, 575.
Paxson, Frederic L., criticism of Turner thesis, 299.
Peabody Education Fund, relation to Slater fund work, 223 ff.
Peaceful Riders by Day, and tobacco wars, 358 ff.
Peck, J. M., cycle of settlement, 310.
Pennington, Alexander C. M., speakership candidate, 190 ff.
"People, William Goebel, and the Kentucky Railroads," by Thomas D. Clark, 34-48.
Peopling of Virginia, by R. Bennett Bean, revd., 257-58.
Perry, Horatio J., relations with Spanish govt., 376.
Perry, Percival, mentioned, 574.
Personal Recollections of Trinity College, North Carolina, 1887-1894, by John F. Crowell, revd., 405-407.
Peters, Francis J., land speculator, 179.
Petrie, George, influence on So. scholarship, 145, 153.
Peyton, Mary Lou, mentioned, 279.
Phillips, U. B., paper on, noted, 74; Negro thesis, 299; and geog. determinism, 340; evaluation of work, 364-71.
Pickett, Courtney, land speculator, 167.
Pierce, Franklin, adm., and speakership election, 187 ff.; and Cuban question, 374; nomination for pres., 537.
Pierpont, Francis H., and W. Va., 118-19.
Planters' Protective Association, and tobacco industry, 352, 354 ff.
Plummer, Franklin, supports homestead bills, 312.
Pomfret, John R., mentioned, 71.
Pooling, tobacco, attempts at, 354 ff.
Popular sovereignty, Douglas' interpretation, 539 ff.
"Population Structure of the Late Ante-Bellum South," by Frank L. Owsley, synop., 69.
Populist movement, effect on hist'l guild, 291-92.
Posey, Walter B., elected to board of eds., 77; mentioned, 78, 124.
Potter, David M., mentioned, 125.
Pre-emption laws, supported by Southerners, 312.
Presbyterian, and Tenn. culture, 27 ff.; liberalism, 393-94.
Presidential address, Philip M. Hamer's, 3-17.
Presidential Election of 1824 in North Carolina, by Albert R. Newsome, revd., 396-97.
Prichard, Walter, "The Effects of the Civil War on the La. Sugar Industry," 63-64, 315-32.
Princeton, Lindsley and, 18-19.
Pritchard, J. C., mentioned, 338.
Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism, by Ray A. Billington, revd., 266-67.
PWA, constructs buildings for archives, 13-14.

Quakers, and hist'l determinism, 345.
Quitman, John A., attempts Cuban filibusters, 374 ff.

Race, prejudice, Reconstruction and, 49 ff.; relations, Reconstruction and, 51 ff.; theory, hist'l determinism and, 334 ff.
Racing, La., and planters, 443-44.
Radicals, Reconstruction policy, 56 ff.
Radoff, Morris, mentioned, 413.
Rae, John, economist, 501 ff.
Ragatz, Lowell J., revs. Craven's *Introduction to the Hist. of Bermuda,* 102-103.
Raglund, Evan, land speculator, 163.
Rainwater, P. L., mentioned, 126, 279, 413.
Ramos, Arthur, *Negro in Brazil,* noted, 575.
Rampaging Frontier: Manners and Humors of Pioneer Days in the South and Middle West, by Thomas D. Clark, revd., 398-99.
Ramsay, David, view of Am. culture, 336.
Ramsdell, Charles W., mentioned, 63; co-ed. Hist. of the So., 278; revs. Craven's *Repressible Conflict,* 553-54.
Ramsey, J. F., mentioned, 276.
Randall, James G., mentioned, 182.
Randall, Samuel J., mentioned, 68.
Randolph, George W., mentioned, 469; relations with Davis, 472.
Raymond, Daniel, nat. econ., 501 ff.

Recollections of War and Peace, 1861-1868, by Anna P. Siviter, revd., 118-19.
Reconstruction, new viewpoints of, 49-61; Fleming's writings on, 146 ff.; and La. sugar industry, 319-32.
"Records of Southern History," by Philip M. Hamer, 3-17.
Red River, La., sugar culture along, 315 ff.
Redwine, D. B., and "Music Hall" convention, 42.
Regier, C. C., revs. Klingberg's *Old Sherry,* 119-20.
Regulator movement, as dem. force, 297.
"Relations Between Judah P. Benjamin and Jefferson Davis: Some New Light on the Working of the Confederate Machine," by Robert D. Meade, 468-78.
Religion, force in frontier culture, 27 ff.; Ger.-Swiss views on, 87 ff.; frontier, in So., 307; as hist'l determinant, 333 ff.; attitude of So. planter, 441; on S. C. frontier, 479-500.
Repressible Conflict, 1830-1861, by Avery Craven, revd., 553-54.
Republican party, in Ky., 1891-1900, pp. 35 ff.; and 1855-56 speakership election, 187; in 1856, as viewed by South, 207; a Canadian view, 247 ff.; Douglas' views conc., 528 ff.
"Research Projects in Southern History; First Annual Supplement," comp. by Fred C. Cole, 581-86.
Resources of Southern Libraries: A Survey of Facilities for Research, ed. by Robert B. Downs, noted, 130.
Revolutionary War, West in, 105-106.
Reynolds, J. H., and Ark. archives, 11.
Rhett, Robert B., views on Benjamin, 472; mentioned, 528.
Rhodes, James Ford, on the Negro, 58.
Ricardo, David, theories, and nat. economists, 501 ff.
Rice, Henry M., land speculator, 175.
Richardson, John P., interest in Negro educ., 241.
Richardson, William A., land speculator, 166; and 1855-56 speakership contest, 190 ff.
Riggs, Elisha, land speculator, 173.
Riggs, George W., land speculator, 166.
Riley, Franklin L., and Miss. archives, 11.
Robert, Joseph C., mentioned, 124.
Roberts, Jesse, manages land speculation, 157-58.
Roberts, W. Adolphe, *Semmes of the Alabama,* revd., 115-17.
Robertson, James A., death noted, 414.
Robinson, James Harvey, mentioned, 145.
Robinson, William M., Jr., revs. Roberts' *Semmes of the Ala.,* 115-17; revs. Hamilton's *Second Cons. for the U. S.,* 121-22.
Robison, Georgia, mentioned, 412.
Roe, Stephen, S. P. G. missionary, 497.
Rorer, Henry S. (ed.), "Cyrus Griffin's Plan of Reconciliation with the Am. Cols.," 98-101.
Rowland, Dunbar, and Miss. archives, 11.
Ruffin, Edmund, mentioned, 63.
Rush, Benjamin, authropological writings, 337-38.
Russell, Josiah C., mentioned, 124.
Russia, relation with U. S., 372 ff.
Rust, Albert, and 1855-56 speakership contest, 200.

Sage, Russell, mentioned, 191.
St. Francisville, La., ante-bellum entrepôt, 432 ff.
St. Mary's, Va., study of hist., 390-92.
Saloutos, Theodore, "Am. Soc. of Equity in Ky.," 347-63.
Sanders, Jennings B., revs. Burns' *James Madison,* 258-59.
Sanford, John, duel with Goebel, 37.
Savannah, Ger.-Swiss emigrants in, 83 ff.
Savannah Indians, relig. work among, 480 ff.
Say, Jean Baptiste, mentioned, 512.
Scalawags, new viewpoints concerning, 56 ff.
Schell, Richard, land speculator, 175.
Schlesinger, Arthur M., mentioned, 275.
Schmidt, Louis B., mentioned, 276.
Schools, public, Tenn., 22 ff.
Schreeven, William J. Van, mentioned, 125.
Science, So., B. L. C. Wailes and, 114-15.
Scotch-Irish, and frontier development, 295, 298.
Scott, Isaac W., land speculator, 167.
Scott, Matthew T., land speculator, 167.
Scott, Matthew T., Jr., land speculator, 167.
Scott, Winfield, nomination for pres., 537.
Scully, William, land speculator, 160.
Sears, Barnas, and Peabody fund, 225.
Seay, Thomas, and Slater fund work, 239-40.
Secession, a Canadian view of, 250 ff.; Douglas' views conc., 548 ff.
Secession and Restoration of Louisiana, by Willie M. Caskey, revd., 268-69.
Second Constitution for the United States of America, by Hugh L. Hamilton, revd., 121-22.
Sectionalism, and Turner thesis, 293 ff.
Seddon, James A., mentioned, 469.
Seegers, L. Walter, mentioned, 125.
Segments of Southern Thought, by Edd W. Parks, revd., 558-60.

Seibels, J. J., and Fr.-Br. relations, 377; and Douglas, 529.
Seligman, Edwin R. A., mentioned, 145.
Seminole War, issue in Jackson adm., 453 ff.
Semmes, Raphael, *Crime and Punishment in Early Md.*, revd., 255-57.
Semmes of the Alabama, by W. Adolphe Roberts, revd., 115-17.
Semple, Ellen, mentioned, 339.
Sequel of Appomattox, by W. L. Fleming, appraised, 147.
Seward, William H., criticized by Douglas, 531 ff.
Shaler, Nathaniel S., mentioned, 339.
Shanks, Henry T., revs. Siviter's *Recollections of War and Peace,* 118-19.
Share-crop system, development of, 53 ff.; and tobacco industry, 348 ff.
Sheppard, George, life, 245-46; views on 1860-61 parties and issues, 247-53.
Sherman, John, mentioned, 191.
Sherman, W. T., 1864-65 campaigns, 400-401.
Sherman Anti-Trust Act, and tobacco organizations, 362.
Short, Charles W., speculator in lands, 170.
Short History of the Americas, by R. S. Cotterill, noted, 575.
Shorter, Eli S., speculates in lands, 171-72, 177.
Shotwell, James T., *Hist. of Hist.,* revd., 386-87.
Shryock, Richard H., "Cultural Factors in the Hist. of the So.," 68-69, 333-46.
Shugg, Roger W., mentioned, 124, 125.
"Significance of the Frontier in American History," by Frederick Jackson Turner, evaluated, 293 ff.
Siler, Adam T., mentioned, 47.
Simkins, Francis B., "New Viewpoints of So. Reconstruction," 49-61.
Simms, Fenton, mentioned, 39.
Sitterson, J. Carlisle, mentioned, 276, 413.
Siviter, Anna P., *Recollections of War and Peace,* revd., 118-19.
Skipper, O. C., "J. D. B. De Bow and the Seventh Census," synop., 73-74.
"Slater Fund Beginnings: Letters from General Agent Atticus G. Haygood to Rutherford B. Hayes," ed. by Curtis W. Garrison, 223-45.
"Slave Insurrection Panic of 1856," by Harvey Wish, 206-22.
Slave Insurrections in the United States, 1800-1865, by Joseph C. Carroll, revd., 265-66.
Slavery, effect of destroying, 51 ff.; effect of Fed. invasion on, 67; extent, 69; in col. S. C., 89 ff.; trade, 109-110; and Kan.-Neb. question, 187 ff.; a Canadian view, 252-53; attitudes toward, and Turner thesis, 297 ff.; frontier development and, 309 ff.; and La. sugar industry, 318 ff.; and hist'l determinism, 337 ff.; expansion, Cuba and, 373 ff.; Thomas Clarkson and, 392-93; on La. plantation, 436 ff.; emancipation offered, 476; S. P. G. work among, 480 ff.; in Ware's pol. econ., 514, 516 ff.; Douglas' attitude toward, 529 ff.; defense and abolitionism, 553-54.
Sloane, William M., mentioned, 145.
Smith, Adam, pol. econ. attacked, 501 ff.
Smith, Alfred E., mentioned, 49.
Smith, Charles E., mentioned, 276; revs., Shotwell's *Hist. of Hist.,* 386-87.
Smith, Culver H., mentioned, 276.
Smith, Francis L., land speculator, 179, 184.
Smith, Hoke, mentioned, 50.
Smith, Captain John, mentioned, 336.
Smith, Milton H., mentioned, 37, 40.
Smith, Robert W., land speculator, 179, 184.
Smith, Samuel A., and 1855-56 speakership contest, 201.
Smith, Samuel S., mentioned, 18.
Smith, William R., supports homestead bills, 312.
Smithson, William T., banking house, speculation in land, 164, 179.
Social life, in frontier Tenn., 19 ff.; in ante-bellum La., 433 ff.
Social Science Research Council, grant-in-aid appointments, 574.
Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, in S. C., 479-500.
Sonne, Niels H., *Liberal Ky.,* revd., 393-94.
Soule, Pierre, and Ostend Manifesto, 373 ff.
"South and Northern Democratic Congressional Leaders during Reconstruction and After," by Albert V. House, Jr., synop., 67-68.
South Carolina, preservation of hist'l records, 6, 8; Reconstruction, 50; Ger.-Swiss emigrants in, 83-97; pol. and jud. hist., 120-21; capital, invested in No. lands, 156 ff.; Slater fund work, 238 ff.; emigration from, 300 ff.; internal improvements, 395-96; frontier, as seen by missionaries, 479-500.
Southern Biography Series, announced, 128.
"Southern Designs on Cuba, 1854-1857, and Some European Opinions," ed. by Gavin B. Henderson, 371-85.
Southern Historical Association, fourth ann. meeting, 62-75; committees appointed, 123; to participate in Miss. Valley Hist'l meeting, 123-24; joint session with American Hist'l Assoc., 126.

"Southern Investments in Northern Lands before the Civil War," by Paul W. Gates, 155-85.
Spain, diplomacy, 119-20; Cuban annexation and, 374 ff.
Spanish, S. P. G. relig. work among, 491-92.
Specie Circular, Jackson's, effect on land speculation, 168-69.
Spence, H. E., revs. Gobbel's *Church-State Relationship in Educ. in N. C.,* 272-73.
Spiller, Mrs. Wood, mentioned, 79.
Sports, ante-bellum La., 433 ff.
Spruill, Julia C., *Women's Life and Work in the So. Cols.,* revd., 254-55.
Squatter sovereignty, a Canadian view, 247; Douglas' interpretation, 539 ff.
Squatters, Tenn. land laws and, 25 ff.
Stanley, Augustus O., supports farmers' organizations, 352.
Starling, Lyne, "loan shark," 157.
State rights, a Canadian view, 249; Berrien and, 465-67; Ware and, 501 ff.; Douglas' views on, 530 ff.
Steele, Franklin, land speculator, 175.
Steffan, Mr. and Mrs. George, assist in trans. of Tobler MSS., 84.
Stephens, Alexander H., and 1855-56 speakership election, 189 ff.; and Whig policy, 537.
Stephens, Ruth, mentioned, 125.
Stephenson, Wendell H., mentioned, 76, 128, 276; *Isaac Franklin,* revd., 109-10; co-ed. Hist. of the So., 278.
Stern, Philip V. D., *Man Who Killed Lincoln,* revd., 401-402.
Stevens, Robert, S. P. G. missionary, 483 ff.
Stevenson, Andrew, mentioned, 197.
Stokes, William B., land speculator, 170, 179, 183.
Stone, Alfred H., revs., Stephenson's *Isaac Franklin,* 109-10.
Stone, W. J., Ky. gov. candidate, 37, 42.
Strateman, Katherine, mentioned, 412.
Stroupe, Henry S., mentioned, 574.
Stuart, A. H. H., and Negro educ., 224.
Sugar industry, La., 63-64; effects of Civil War on, 315-32.
"Sugar Nabobs," identified, 317.
Summersell, Charles G., mentioned, 276.
Sumner, Charles, assaulted by Brooks, 206; criticized by Douglas, 531.
"Survey of Historic Sites in the South," by Roy E. Appleman, synop., 65.
Swann, Thomas, land speculator, 168.
Swartwout, Samuel, mentioned, 165.
Swearingen, Mack, mentioned, 76, 125; revs. Carter's (comp. and ed.) *Territorial Papers of U. S.,* VI, 108-109; revs. Capers' *Biog. of a River Town,* 554-55.
Sweeny, Rittenhouse, and Fant, dealers in land warrants, 164.
Swint, Henry L., mentioned, 412.
Swiss, German, emigrants to S. C., 83-97.
Sydnor, Charles S., mentioned, 78, 124, 278; *Benjamin L. C. Wailes,* revd., 114-15; revs. Newsome's *Pres. Election of 1824 in N. C.,* 396-97; "Theory and Practice of Geology in the So.," synop., 70-71.

Tabb, Philip M., invests in No. lands, 157-58.
Talman, James J. (ed.), "A Canadian View of Parties and Issues on the Eve of the Civil War," 245-53.
Taney, Roger B., and Jackson adm., 455 ff.
Tariff, Berrien's attitude toward, 449 ff.; and Ga. politics, 464-68.
Tate, Vernon D., mentioned, 413.
Tax, excise, and sugar industry, 321 ff.
Taylor, Rosser H. (co-ed.), *Memoirs of Richard Cannon Watts,* revd., 120-21.
Taylor, William, S. P. G. secy., 492 ff.
Taylor, William S., Rep. candidate for Ky. gov., 43 ff.; dispute over election, 45-46.
Teche, sugar planting on, 315 ff.
Temperance societies, Tenn. Baptists and, 30.
Tenant-farmers, and tobacco wars, 348 ff.
Tennessee, archive authority, 12; culture vs. frontier, 18-33; slave insurrection panic, 209-15, 222; Slater fund work, 232 ff.; Lindsley's work in, 261-62; emigration from, 300 ff.; and Indian question, 447; financial scandal, 570-71.
Terhune, Thornton, mentioned, 126.
Territorial Papers of the United States, VI, *The Territory of Mississippi, 1809-1817,* comp. & ed. by Clarence E. Carter, revd., 108-109.
Territories, Douglas' view conc., 531 ff.
Texas, preservation of hist'l records, 6; slave insurrection panic in, 207-209; Slater fund work, 228, 238 ff.; and Turner thesis, 302 ff.; La. planters' interest in, 444; annexation, Douglas' views, 534.
35,000 Days in Texas: A History of the Dallas News and Its Forbears, by Sam Acheson, revd., 270-72.
Thomas, Dan H., mentioned, 276.
Thomas, Samuel, S. P. G. missionary, 486 ff.
Thomas Clarkson: The Friend of Slaves, by Earl Leslie Griggs, revd., 392-93.
Thompson, Holland, revs., Crowell's *Personal Recollections,* 405-407.
Thompson, Thomas, S. P. G. missionary, 497.
Thurman, Allen G., mentioned, 68.
Tifft, Solomon, land speculator, 177.
Tillman, Ben, views on Reconstruction, 50.

Tobacco industry, Am. Soc. of Equity and, 347-63.
Tobler, John, account of emigration to S. C., 83-98.
Tobler, Ulric, identified, 95.
Toombs, Robert, land speculator, 182; mentioned, 528.
Townes, John E., mentioned, 125.
Trexler, H. A., revs. McCordock's *Yankee Cheese Box,* 117-18; revs. James' *George W. Truett,* 410.
Trinity College, study of development, 405-407.
Troup, George M., and Jackson adm., 452 ff.
Truett, George W., biog., revd., 410.
Trumbull, Lyman, and land speculators, 181-82.
Tulane University, host to So. Hist'l Assoc., 72.
Turner, Frederick J., mentioned, 153-54; early writings and bibliog., revd., 387-89; Phillips and, 370; thesis discussed, 65; hist. interpretation, and South, 291-314.
Turner, Nat, slave insurrection, 206.
"'Turner Theories' and the South," by Avery Craven, 291-314.
Tyler, John, political policies, 397-98.

"Ulrich Bonnell Phillips: Historian of the South," by Fred Landon, 364-71.
University of Nashville, Lindsley and, 23 ff.

Van Buren, Martin, and Jackson adm., 447 ff.
Van Deusen, John G., *Black Man in White America,* revd., 565-66.
Vance, Rupert B., revs. Gallagher's *American Caste and the Negro College,* 273-74; mentioned, 278.
Vardaman, James K., mentioned, 50.
Varnod, Francis, S. P. G. missionary, 481 ff.
Varnton, H. W., land speculator, 179.
Venable, A. S., mentioned, 413.
Vesey, Denmark, slave insurrection leader, 206.
Viles, Jonas, mentioned, 413.
Virginia, preservation of hist'l records, 5 ff.; dept. of archives and hist., 12; frontier hist., 103-104; Hist'l Records Survey work, 131; capital, invested in No. lands, 156 ff.; slave insurrection plots, 219-21; col. justice in, 255-57; origin of settlers, 257-58; emigration from, 300 ff.; hist'l influences, 334 ff.; early cities, 390-92.
Virginia Historical Society, acquisitions, 282, 575.

Wailes, B. L. C., biography revd., 114-15.
Waite, Morrison R., Peabody Trustee, 224.
Walden, Lord Howard de, and Cuban annexation question, 379.
Walker, Burnis, mentioned, 413.
Walker, Robert J., and land speculations, 164-66, 174, 177, 307-308.
Walkley, Seldon S., speculates in No. lands, 172.
Wallace, David A., S. C. map comp., 281.
Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures, given by Herbert A. Kellar, 275.
Ward, Judson C., mentioned, 125, 412.
Ware, Catherine Ann, writer, identified, 504-505.
Ware, Nathaniel A., nat. economist, career and writings, 501-26.
Washington, Booker T., and Slater fund work, 241.
Washington, George, and Va. frontier hist., 104.
Washington, L. Q., mentioned, 474.
Watson, Richard L., Jr., mentioned, 574.
Watson, Tom, mentioned, 50.
Watterson, Henry, and Ky. politics, 39-40.
Watts, Richard Cannon, memoirs, revd., 120-21.
Webb, Walter P., and Yankee exploitation, 339.
Webster, Daniel, and Whigs, 537.
Weed, Thurlow, mentioned, 188; and 1855-56 speakership contest, 204-205; abolitionist, 221.
Weld, Theodore Dwight, mentioned, 366.
Wells, William C., precursor of Darwin, 338.
Wertenbaker, Thomas J., and cavalier tradition, 338-39.
West, C. P., mentioned, 125.
West Virginia, preservation of hist'l records, 12-13.
Wharton, Vernon L., mentioned, 412.
Whigs, and 1855-56 speakership election, 187 ff.; Ware as economist of, 503 ff.
White, Elias, land speculator, 161, 180 ff.
White, Hugh L., and Jackson adm., 448 ff.
White, Miles, land speculator, 160-61, 185.
Wider Horizons of American History, by Herbert E. Bolton, revd., 563-64.
Wienefield, R. H., mentioned, 126, 276.
Wiley, B. I., "The Impact of Fed. Invasion on the Institution of Slavery," synop., 67; mentioned, 279; revs. Van Deusen's *Black Man in White Am.,* 565-66.
Williams, Amelia W. (co-ed.), *Writings of Sam Houston,* revd., 259-61.
Williams, Wirt A., mentioned, 279.
Williamsburg Art of Cookery, by Helen Bullock, noted, 280.

Willson, Augustus E., and tobacco wars, 357 ff.
Wilmot Proviso, issue in speakership contest, 198-99.
Wilson, William, and Sons, speculate in No. lands, 159-60.
Windom, William, and So. land speculators, 182.
Windrow, John E., *John Berrien Lindsley,* revd., 261-62.
Winkler, E. W., rpts. on Tex. hist'l agencies, 73.
Winton, George B., mentioned, 78.
Wisconsin, land speculation in, 156 ff.
Wise, Henry, arrests Negroes, 220; mentioned, 470, 473.
Wish, Harvey, "The Slave Insurrection Panic of 1856," 206-22; *George Fitzhugh,* noted, 279; revs. Carroll's *Slave Insurrections in the U. S.,* 265-66.
Wittke, Carl, revs. Clark's *Rampaging Frontier,* 398-99.
Women's Life and Work in the Southern Colonies, by Julia C. Spruill, revd., 254-55.
Woodbury, Levi, mentioned, 455.
Woodward, C. Vann, mentioned, 278; revs., Davidson's *Child Labor Legislation,* 407-408.
Woody, R. H., revs. Horn's *Invisible Empire,* 402-404.
Wright, Irene A., mentioned, 414.
Writings of Sam Houston, 1813-1863, ed. by Amelia W. Williams and Eugene C. Barker, revd., 259-61.
Wysor, William Wirt, life and letters, 119-20.

Yamassee, relig. work among, 480 ff.
Yancey, William L., and 1860 election, 527, 528, 551.
Yankee, exploitation by, and So. development, 339.
Yankee Cheese Box, by Robert S. McCordock, revd., 117-18.

Zollicoffer, Felix K., pro-Neb. Am., 190 ff.
Zueblin (Zubly), David, identified, 96.

The JOURNAL of SOUTHERN HISTORY

VOL. V NOVEMBER, 1939 No. 4



Published quarterly by the

SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME V NOVEMBER, 1939 NUMBER 4

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

BOARD OF EDITORS

JOHN D. BARNHART
Louisiana State University

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL
University of Texas

AVERY O. CRAVEN
University of Chicago

WALTER B. POSEY
Birmingham-Southern College

WILLIAM O. LYNCH
Indiana University

PHILIP DAVIDSON
Agnes Scott College

FRANK L. OWSLEY
Vanderbilt University

W. NEIL FRANKLIN
The National Archives

MANAGING EDITOR
WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE
FRED C. COLE, Louisiana State University

GUARANTOR
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Louisiana State University, University, Louisiana.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME V NOVEMBER, 1939 NUMBER 4

Copyright, 1939, by the Southern Historical Association

CONTENTS

Bennet H. Barrow, Ante-Bellum Planter of the Felicianas. By Edwin Adams Davis 431

John M. Berrien and the Administration of Andrew Jackson. By Thomas P. Govan 447

The Relations between Judah P. Benjamin and Jefferson Davis. By Robert Douthat Meade 468

The Indian Frontier in South Carolina as Seen by the S. P. G. Missionary. By Frank J. Klingberg 479

Nathaniel A. Ware, National Economist. By William Diamond 501

Notes and Documents

The Montgomery Address of Stephen A. Douglas. *Edited by* David R. Barbee and Milledge L. Bonham, Jr. 527

Book Reviews

Craven, *The Repressible Conflict, 1830-1861,* by Charles W. Ramsdell 553

Capers, *The Biography of a River Town: Memphis, Its Heroic Age,* by Mack Swearingen 554

Drake and Orndorff, *From Mill Wheel to Plowshare,* by Herbert A. Kellar 556

Macartney and Dorrance, *The Bonapartes in America,* by E. Merton Coulter 557

Dawson, *A French Regicide in Alabama, 1824-1837,* by W. G. Bean 558

Parks, *Segments of Southern Thought,* by Charles Anderson 558

Holt, *Historical Scholarship in the United States, 1876-1901: As Revealed in the Correspondence of Herbert B. Adams,* by A. R. Newsome 561

Bolton, *Wider Horizons of American History,* by Edward Ott 563

Du Bois, *Black Folk, Then and Now,* by B. B. Kendrick 564

Van Deusen, *The Black Man in White America,* by B. I. Wiley 565

Cayton and Mitchell, *Black Workers and the New Unions,* by H. Clarence Nixon 567

Nixon, *Forty Acres and Steel Mules,* by Albert B. Moore 568

McFerrin, *Caldwell and Company,* by James W. Livingood 570

Communication 572

Historical News and Notices 573

Personal 573

Bibliographical 575

Research Projects in Southern History. First Annual Supplement. *Compiled by* Fred Cole 581

Contributors 587

Bennet H. Barrow, Ante-Bellum Planter of the Felicianas

By EDWIN ADAMS DAVIS

The parish of West Feliciana[1] lies to the east of the Mississippi River, just south of the thirty-first parallel in the northwest corner of that section known as the Florida parishes of Louisiana.[2] The region was occupied early in Louisiana's colonial period, the first whites presumably having located near the Tunica Indians about 1712. Settlement progressed slowly through decades of French and English occupation. During the Spanish regime foreigners were granted land, many of the settlers coming from Virginia and the Carolinas, and by the time the United States acquired title to the territory the greater percentage of the population was American, although as late as 1828 tax collections were published in both French and English to meet the needs of a bilingual

[1] This paper was read at a joint session of the Agricultural History Society and the American Historical Association, Chicago, Illinois, December 28, 1938.

[2] The following works contain descriptions of the region: *An Account of Louisiana* (Washington, 1803), *passim;* Thomas Ashe, *Travels in America* (London, 1809), 294-95; Robert Baird [Richard Bache], *View of the Valley of the Mississippi* (Philadelphia, 1834), 275; William Bartram, *Travels Through North and South Carolina, Georgia, East and West Florida* (Philadelphia, 1791), 432; H. M. Brackenridge, *Views of Louisiana* (Pittsburgh, 1814), 282-83; Theodore Clapp, *Autobiographical Sketches and Recollections* (Boston, 1857), 65; Zadock Cramer, *The Navigator* (Pittsburgh, 1806), 73-74; J. H. Ingraham, *The Sunny South* (Philadelphia, 1860), 296 ff.; Charles Lanman, *Adventures in the Wilds of the United States,* 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1856), I, *passim;* St. Francisville *Louisiana Journal,* May 27, 1828; Dunbar Rowland, *Mississippi,* 3 vols. (Atlanta, 1907), II, 966; Christian Schultz, *Travels on an Inland Voyage Through the States of New York . . . and Through the Territories of Indiana, Louisiana, Mississippi and New Orleans* (New York, 1810), 181; William C. Stubbs, *A Handbook of Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1895), 20; Amos Stoddard, *Sketches of Louisiana* (Philadelphia, 1812), 114-15; D. B. Warden, *A Statistical, Political, and Historical Account of the United States of North America,* 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1819), II, 490-91, 498, 522-23, 531.

society.[3] By 1820 the parish had passed the frontier stage, the best lands having been acquired by those who were to gain economic and political control of the region during the ensuing decade.

The 1830's saw West Feliciana develop into an extremely productive area, and with the southwestern counties of Mississippi it formed one of the richest economic sections south of Mason and Dixon's line. Here was found one of the few examples of the traditional old plantation South—a region where the modern legend actually existed: large plantations, an intelligent and cultured aristocracy, a gentry of sturdy stock, an important entrepôt in Bayou Sara-St. Francisville, and great wealth based on cotton and sugar cane. Plantation homes such as Rosedown (with its formal gardens, including marble statuary, as laid out by a French landscape architect), Ellerslie, Highland, The Cottage, Waverly, and others boasted a hospitality so well described by Timothy Flint: "The opulent planters . . . have many amiable traits of character. They are high-minded and hospitable in an eminent degree. I have sojourned much among them, and have never experienced a more frank, dignified, and easy hospitality."[4]

A member of this aristocratic feudal group was Bennet H. Barrow, master of Highland plantation. He was the youngest son of William Barrow, II, who migrated from North Carolina to the Felicianas during the late 1790's and settled Locust Grove plantation on the waters of Little Bayou Sara about twelve miles northwest of St. Francisville.[5] He grew to manhood during a period of rapid plantation expansion, received little formal education, married at nineteen years of age,[6] and, having inherited the home place of 1,400 arpents,[7] renamed it High-

[3] St. Francisville *Louisiana Journal,* June 21, 1828.

[4] Timothy Flint, *Recollections of the Last Ten Years, Passed in Occasional Residences and Journeyings in the Valley of the Mississippi . . .* (Boston, 1826), 322.

[5] For the Barrow family records, the writer is indebted to Mrs. D. I. Norwood of Highland plantation, Bains, Louisiana; Mrs. Leo Charles Browne of New Orleans; and Mrs. Wade Noland, Bains, Louisiana.

[6] Barrow's wife was Miss Emily Joor. For the Joor family records, the writer is indebted to Miss Harriet Joor, Lafayette, Louisiana, and Mrs. Bentley Nicholson, New Orleans. Mrs. D. I. Norwood kindly lent C. B. Joor, "History of the Joors" (MSS. written in 1839).

[7] Inventory of the estate of William Barrow, in West Feliciana Parish, Inventory Records, A, 327-42. Cited hereafter as Inventory Records. William Barrow left an estate in-

land, and in 1830 began his planting career. From 1833 to 1846 he kept a diary which gives a penetrative picture of various phases of Southern rural life: efforts at planting, sporting interests, the social life of the plantation, and, in many instances, personal feelings and opinions on matters public and private.[8] He was continuously engaged in land deals; since he purchased much more often than he sold, his transactions gradually increased the total of his holdings. Full cash payment was rare, the usual procedure calling for approximately one third down, the balance within a three-year period; thus he depended upon his cotton and sugar crops to meet his payments. He was a shrewd buyer and usually purchased land at a "fair" price if not at a "bargain." At his death in 1854 he owned six plantations, approximately 5,000 arpents, appraised at slightly over $70,000.[9]

Barrow faced the common financial problems of the Southland and attempted to work them out in much the same manner as contemporary agriculturists did in other sections of the plantation area. He was often careless and occasionally the disastrous results of his negligence turned his customary optimism into deep gloom.[10] The constant purchase of land was a common Southern extravagance and therein he was no exception. Money was borrowed from banks and private individuals, and was loaned, though in much smaller amounts. Throughout his planting career he fulminated about the economic conditions of the time, the

ventoried at $214,930.83, which included 7,160 arpents of land divided into six plantations. It also embraced 348 slaves and a secretary and books estimated at $600. The arpent was an old French measure of land varying with the locality from .84 to 1.28 acres.

[8] "The Plantation Diary of Bennet H. Barrow, 1833-1846," May 20, September 5, 1845. Cited hereafter as Diary. The diary is in one leather bound volume of approximately 500 manuscript pages. It is now in the possession of Mrs. Wade Noland, Bains, Louisiana, to whom the writer is indebted for permission to use it. Two typescript copies are at Louisiana State University, one in the Hill Memorial Library and one in the Department of Archives.

[9] West Feliciana Parish, Notarial Records, E, 122-24, 320-21; F, 33-34, 258-59, 317-18; H, 346-48; K, 347-48. Cited hereafter as Notarial Records. See, also, Inventory Records, G, 135-43, for the inventory of his property.

[10] On May 20, 1845, he wrote in his Diary: "By some carelessness have Lost a Letter from the Miss Swifts enclosed were two or three Blank notes & power of Attᵛ. to me as their agent, never in my Life had any thing to worry me as much—recollect of having it at my desk. suppose some of the children have destroyed it." He found the notes and power-of-attorney several months later. Diary, September 5, 1845.

antics of the politicians, and the insidious effect of the British market on the agricultural economy of the South. During the panic of 1837 he recorded in his diary that it was "all most impossible to raise one dollars. and that in shin plasters," but the bottom was not reached until 1842 when he reported that money was as "high as 4 per *ct* a month" and "scarce at that."[11]

His commercial relations with his New Orleans factors were usually satisfactory.[12] For a period he transacted business with Finley and Company, but in 1839 changed to A. Ledoux and Company, "the best salesmen in the city," who promised to stamp his full name on his cotton bales instead of the usual B. H. B. and who immediately secured three and a half cents per pound more than he had theretofore received.[13] It is impossible to determine accurately his yearly sales, which fluctuated between $7,274 and $24,839, or the amount of his indebtedness, though his diary records numerous loans.[14] Ordinarily an amicable relationship existed between him and his creditors, but when one of them in 1840 unexpectedly called for his money, Barrow characterized his action as "most illiberal to make the least of it."[15] A few months later he noted, "saw Mr. Turnbull [the owner of Rosedown] yesterday the only independent man to be met—Fat and pockets full of money."[16] He generally collected his own loans without trouble and apparently was easily prevailed upon to endorse his neighbors' notes, a propensity responsible for many of his monetary misfortunes.[17] A note for $40,000

[11] *Ibid.*, January 2, 14, 1838; March 29, 1842.

[12] For a brief although excellent study of the Southern cotton marketing system, see Alfred H. Stone, "The Cotton Factorage System of the Southern States," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XX (1915), 557-65.

[13] Diary, September 28, 1836; October 6, 31, 1838; October 5, 26, 1839; Barrow Accounts, October, 1839; July, 1840 (Louisiana State University Department of Archives). See, also, for the above-mentioned commission merchants, New Orleans *Price-Current and Commercial Intelligencer, passim.*

[14] Diary, January 30, 1837; February 6, 1839; April 12, 1840; Barrow Accounts, 1839-1845.

[15] Diary, March 11, 1840.

[16] *Ibid.*, October 5, 1842.

[17] The generalization of Carl R. Fish, *The Rise of the Common Man, 1830-1850* (New York, 1927), 156, although perhaps hasty and inaccurate, is interesting in view of Barrow's experience with I. Desmont: "In the South . . . honor was to a large extent confused with honesty. This led to many tragedies from its misuse by the careless and by the

was endorsed, an obligation promptly settled, but between 1836 and 1846 Barrow evidently lost a little over $22,000 on neighbors and friends. His largest loss was to I. Desmont, an English physician of "uncommonly gentlemanly manners—modesty and chastity," who later quit the country leaving him to pay between $10,000 and $16,000.[18] The incident made a severe impression on the young planter, for in January, 1840, he remarked, "This crop would have paid every Dollar I owed—but owing to my Endorsing—Will take two more crops to clear me of Debt—never Endorse . . . for a man Extravagant & careless in business."[19] Thus was the milk of Southern generosity curdled by contact with gentlemanly rascality.

Routine and production on a large plantation presented problems similar to those faced by the operator of any large economic unit.[20] Though production of staple crops was a major objective, there was a multiplicity of tasks to be performed during a twelvemonth: land to be cleared; stumps burned or pulled; staple and other crops planted and cultivated; buildings, implements, and tools repaired; spinning, weaving, sewing, and basket-making to satisfy the needs of nearly two hundred black folk—the thousand and one tasks the flesh was heir to on a well-organized plantation. Routine was well planned and executed: the completion of one task saw another begun and the vagaries of weather never halted slave labor long, for plantation efficiency did not allow idleness.

unscrupulous. A real Southern gentleman could rarely refuse to endorse a note if asked by another seeming gentleman. The number of families driven to penury by such careless assumptions of the risks of others is beyond belief, and in many cases the original signer of the note had nothing to risk, or protected himself by assignment to his wife or others."

[18] Diary, August 20, November 9, December 19, 1839; Barrow Accounts, 1839.

[19] Diary, January 21, 1840.

[20] The following articles will prove helpful in securing a picture of plantation routine and production in the St. Francisville-Natchez district: R. L. Allen, "Agriculture of Louisiana," in *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), III (1847), 412-17; Louise Butler, "West Feliciana, A Glimpse of Its History," in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (New Orleans, 1917-), VII (1924), 90-120; Mack Swearingen, "Thirty Years of a Mississippi Plantation: Charles Whitmore of 'Montpelier,'" in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), I (1935), 198-211; Wendell H. Stephenson, "A Quarter-Century of a Mississippi Plantation: Eli J. Capell of 'Pleasant Hill,'" in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1915-), XXIII (1936), 355-74.

Barrow's money crop was cotton. His yearly planting averaged between 600 and 750 acres, which yielded an annual production of from 375 to slightly under 700 bales. In the early 1840's he began to experiment with sugar cane, finally turning to that crop as a staple shortly before his death a decade later.[21] The making of a good crop was a source of satisfaction to the master of Highland, for appreciatory comments of visitors and neighbors were entered in his diary. On one occasion he recorded, "they have seen no crop at all to compare with it, from half leg to waist high bolled & formed as well as can be for the season several grown Boles on a stalk."[22] Sometimes lice, worms, grasshoppers, and other pests plagued him or plant diseases distracted his equanimity. In 1840 he wrote, "Never saw worse looking cotton. twisted trash beat in it & stained cotton blown so as not able to trace the rows, worms Eating all the Leaves off."[23] His slaves caused him little trouble, leading him to record: "never saw hands Work as Well, have never said a word to them—feeling an interest, they look a head and see What is to be done."[24] That they picked unusually well on occasion is evidenced by the fact that on one November day in 1838 the average picking was 364½ pounds for forty-two pickers.[25]

Highland made a definite attempt to reach self-sufficiency. Oats, hay, and fodder were produced for livestock, corn and peas for both man and beast. The plantation truck garden had a regular crew of workers

[21] Diary, January 24, March 17, 28, November 12, 1843; May 27, July 22, November 1, 1844. Barrow's work was carried on by his two eldest sons, John and James J. Barrow. Upon his death in 1854, they took over the management of the plantation and within a few years came to be numbered among the largest sugar producers of the parish. Their crop of 1857-1858 totaled 430 hogsheads. Two years later the crop remained about the same figure, but in 1861-1862 James J. Barrow, who had taken over the management of Highland plantation, produced 650 hogsheads. At this time he was the second largest sugar producer in West Feliciana, being exceeded only by William R. Barrow, an uncle. During this period vacuum pans were used, but by 1870 he had made many improvements. He had a brick and slate roof sugarhouse and refined his sugar by steam train, vacuum, and centrifugal methods. See P. A. Champomier, *Statement of the Sugar Crop Made in Louisiana in 1857-58* (New Orleans, 1858), 3; *ibid., 1859-60* (New Orleans, 1860), 3; L. Bouchereau, *Statement of the Sugar and Rice Crops Made in Louisiana in 1870-71* (New Orleans, 1871), 5.

[22] Diary, June 12, 1842.

[23] *Ibid.*, September 4, 22, 29, 1840.

[24] *Ibid.*, April 16, 1840.

[25] Compiled from Barrow's table of cotton pickings.

in season, and potatoes, of the Irish and sweet varieties, pumpkins, beans, and other vegetables brought welcome dietary changes. Tobacco was grown for home consumption. The orchards below the quarter yielded peaches, plums, apples, and other fruits. Watermelons were produced on a large scale and during hot summer weather blacks became well acquainted with their tasty succulence. Between seventy and eighty head of work horses and mules were kept, and three or four yoke of oxen saw service getting timber and wood out of the swamps. Cattle numbered from one hundred and fifty to two hundred head, and on special occasions the inhabitants of the quarters were allowed fresh beef. Hogs, as well as sheep, were raised in large numbers, as many as three hundred being in the pens at one time. Large flocks of the usual barnyard fowls were kept for both their fruit and flesh, and many doubtless found their way surreptitiously into the steaming pots of slave cabins.

The effective operation of a plantation necessitated the use of machinery and involved the direction of a certain amount of mechanical work. Barrow, like most planters, depended upon the hoe as the most important tool of cotton production, but whenever possible he used horse-drawn implements.[26] His gins and presses were steam-driven, and by the late 1830's his sawmill and grinding mills had been converted from horsepower to steam power. Machinery was operated by slaves but repairs required the services of expert white labor at an average cost of about $2.00 per day. Breakdowns often necessitated sending to New Orleans for parts, and work ceased until blacksmiths could make proper replacements.

Barrow was not a scientific planter. To be sure, he took agricultural journals, kept fairly well abreast of the times, and occasionally made experiments, but he is not to be counted among those patrons of Ceres who were more interested in agricultural improvements than in lucrative returns. He rotated crops, he manured fields (though it is not recorded that he ever purchased guano or commercial fertilizer), and he hauled

[26] It is interesting to note that the planter often depended upon his "Driver" to select the hoes purchased. Diary, June 5, 1838; April 1, 1840.

rich leafy molds from the nearby timber tracts. In 1837 he tried wrapping paper around seed corn; he grafted pear, peach, and apple trees; he practiced various methods for ridding his fields of squirrels and raccoons.[27] But his most profitable remuneration resulted from studying and improving the mechanical working habits of his field hands.[28]

The thesis has been advanced that the most striking feature of Southern life was that black slaves furnished the bulk of its labor supply, not that her economic system was based on a staple crop. The plantation revolved around the slave quarter and Barrow undoubtedly took more time in the general organization of his plantation labor system than did many of the planter class. Barrow prepared rules for the government of his slaves with great care and rigidly enforced them.[29] As he phrased it, "A plantation might be considered as a piece of machinery, to operate successfully, all its parts should be uniform and exact." The master should be considered the "impelling force," and unless he was interested in the "proceedings" on his plantations, nothing but "indifference" was to be expected from his Negroes.[30] The slave's life was a regulated one; his sole purpose in being was the advancement of his master's economic interests. He could not marry away from the plantation; he could not wander about the country during the holidays or inclement weather; in fact, the quarters were the center of his world, for Barrow believed that if the slave was made "comfortable at Home," if the essentials of contentment were provided for him, there would be little inclination for him to shirk his work or be dissatisfied. In his general outlook on the institution of slavery, he was typical of his time and section. He dis-

[27] *Ibid.*, October 27, 1837; March 27, April 13, 1838; January 22, 1840.

[28] Of this experiment he wrote: "I am well paid for my trouble in teaching my small gang to Hoe, never saw such hoe hands as they are, two year[s] ago took two on a row—now Eaquel to a woman, in dricting them to make a slow & sure lick in one place & to cut the full width of the hoe every time—unless reminded of it they would stand & make 4 or 5." *Ibid.*, April 16, 1840.

[29] In addition to the works of Ulrich B. Phillips, descriptions of plantation management may be found in Valcour Aime, *Plantation Diary* (New Orleans, 1878); Franklin L. Riley (ed.), "The Diary of Dr. John M. Phillips," in Mississippi Historical Society, *Publications* (Oxford, etc., 1897-1914; Centenary Series, 1916-1925), X (1909), 305-481; "Dr. John C. Jenkins Plantation Diary" (Elgin plantation, Natchez, Mississippi, typescript in Department of Archives, Louisiana State University).

[30] The "Rules for Highland Plantation" are found in Barrow's Diary.

approved of the abolition movement and condemned bitterly all forms of close association between planter and slave.[31] On the other hand, he could not condone extreme cruelty to that underprivileged class, in one instance saying, "A meaner set than the Howells do not live—cruel and unjust in the extreme,"[32] and in another narrating graphically, "Went to Town man tried for Whipping a negro to Death. trial will continue till to morrow—deserves death—Cleared!"[33] He commented in his diary on the character of certain of his slaves. On the death of Old Orange, he wrote: "A more perfect negro never lived, faithful honest & purely religious, never knew him guilty of a *wrong*."[34] When George was drowned, the entry ran thus: "a very great loss. one of the best negros I ever saw. or knew. to his family as a White person."[35] On more than one occasion he defended his slaves when accused unjustly of some crime committed in the neighborhood and once came to the financial aid of Jerry who had had $4.00 in counterfeit money passed off on him.[36] On the other hand, he censured erring hands and once called Jim "the meanest, dirtiest boy I ever had."[37]

While it is impossible to determine the exact number of black folks living at Highland plantation, there apparently were slightly less than two hundred. Barrow's accounts show that while he bought a few slaves from time to time, with one exception they were all purchased in Louisiana,[38] and that, during the entire period under consideration, he sold only two Negroes. In 1836 he sent Big Sam and Amy to New Orleans,

[31] In the Diary, March 20, 1840, he wrote: "Wash. Pennington repairing my Gin—the most perfect fool I know—stands and talks to the negros &c. negros no more respect *him* than a negro."

[32] *Ibid.*, September 15, 1840.

[33] *Ibid.*, May 21, 1839.

[34] *Ibid.*, January 15, 1843.

[35] *Ibid.*, October 7, 1837.

[36] In 1839 a neighbor's gin was "fired" and Dennis was blamed. Whereupon Barrow planned a call upon the neighbor, and wrote, "if he says it was Dennis I will curse him and if I ever catch one of his negros on this side of the creek will make them see sights." *Ibid.*, December 11, 1839.

[37] *Ibid.*, January 24, 1838.

[38] Regarding Negroes from the Upper South he wrote: "I will never buy grown negros from Va.—or upper Country—small boys and girls may do, but grown ones are not worth as much—by at least one third as our creoles—one creole will pick as much as two of them." *Ibid.*, October 18, 1836.

realizing $1,760 for the pair and recording that they were "not worth $5." Until the fall of 1837 Barrow employed overseers to direct his plantation labor but at that time he became so exasperated that he wrote: "More Whiping to do this Fall than all together in three years owing to my D mean Overseer—never will have another unless I should be compelled to leave—they are a perfect nuisance."[39] Evidently from this time until his death he depended on himself and his drivers to keep the organization moving.[40]

The master of Highland believed his slaves to be above average, for he frequently mentioned their good qualities. They were well housed and fed, and received gifts of clothing and money at Christmas time.[41] They were divided into rival gangs for cotton picking or other stipulated tasks, with the losing side giving dinners; and individuals sometimes worked against each other for a prize donated by the master. There were times, however, when work was not well done and he was prompted to make entries such as the following: "my Hands worked badly . . . general Whiping," or "Whipped every hand in the field this evening."[42] From numerous notations in his diary it would appear that his slaves were a sickly lot; a closer scrutiny, however, shows this was not the case: medical attention was provided on every necessary occasion, with physician's bills during some years totaling well over $500. Despite all precautions, lockjaw, ruptures, pleurisy, influenza, common colds, and injuries of various types were a constant source of worry.

[39] *Ibid.*, October 2, 1837.

[40] On one occasion he wrote: "I hope the time will come When every Overseer in the country will be compelled to addopt some other mode of making a living—they are a perfect nuisance cause dissatisfaction among the negros—being more possessed of more brutal feelings—I make better crops than those Who employ them." *Ibid.*, July 25, 1839.

[41] In his "Rules" Barrow explained: "I prefer giving them money of Christmas to their making any thing, thereby creating an interest with you and yours . . . if a negro is suffered to sell any thing he chooses without any inquiry being made, a spirit of trafficing at once is created. to carry this on, both means and time are necessary, neither of which is he of right possessed. A negro would not be content to sell only What he raises or makes of either corn . . . or poultry, or the like, but he would sell a part of his allowance allso, and would be tempted to commit robberies to obtain things to sell." The monetary gift for 1838 amounted to $500, but it was increased to $700 during the two succeeding years. Diary, December 24, 1838; December 22, 1839; December 24, 1840; Barrow Accounts, 1839, 1841.

[42] Diary, January 4, April 27, 1839.

Neglect of midwives or mothers took a heavy toll of infants and many were lost through reporting illness too late for medical attention. Barrow was not a strict religionist, but "Sunday being a day of rest to the negros, I like to be about—allowance day—& they frequently want things not convenient to get any other day."[43] He did not force religion upon his people, and on one occasion when a neighbor's slaves were "cutting up a great many shines" he wrote that the trouble had grown out of having "preached to [them] for 4 or 5 years past—greatest piece of foolishness any one ever guilty of no true Christianity among Church going Whites—& how Expect to Preach morrality among a set of ignorant beings—proper discipline may improve them and make them better."[44] Slave marriages were common at Highland and interracial promiscuity was bitterly condemned, for on one occasion he wrote: "had a general Whiping frollick. White men sending for some of my women by one of my boys. 'one eyed Sam'—a loade of buck shot will be the dose if I can see them or find them."[45]

Barrow was very particular about housing conditions: cabins were repaired yearly, new wells dug or old ones cleaned, and additional buildings erected to offset depredations of time. The jail, though used infrequently, was always kept in good repair. In 1838 a dance hall was constructed and was often used. Barrow was generous in the clothing allotment of two suits per year, two extra pairs of shoes for winter months, and new blankets every third year, with an occasional new suit or a new dress as a reward for good work. Food supplies were carefully watched. Meat was the foundation of slave diet and the allowance was ordinarily five pounds of "Clear good meat" per week for each slave above the age of four years.[46] Hogs, sheep, cattle, and poultry were consumed in large quantities, particularly during holiday periods. Large supplies of molasses and sugar were bought to satisfy the sweet

[43] *Ibid.*, March 30, 1840; also in "Rules for Highland Plantation."

[44] Diary, April 19, 1844. On October 11 Barrow wrote: "went to Miss Swifts. nearly all of their hands have run off. from pure impudence founded in their 'Negros.' religion, & wish by that means to run the overseer off, will see them put in order, my health permitting."

[45] *Ibid.*, September 4, 1837.

[46] "Rules for Highland Plantation."

tooth of the black, and, to offer variety from the ordinary ration of cornmeal, flour was sometimes purchased.[47]

The Black Code caused Barrow little anxiety, for there is no record that any violations of consequence were ever attributed to his slaves. The stealing of small articles was of course a common problem and light cotton pickings, punishments, and imagined abuses were frequent causes for the taking of French leave by the inhabitants of the quarter.[48] Barrow usually rounded up his own runaways, though on one occasion he sent for professional slave hunters. For habitual absconders he sometimes prescribed rough treatment, the description of one incident being: "ran and trailed about a mile *treed* him, made the dogs pull him out of the tree, Bit him very badly, think he will stay home a while."[49] Of a similar case he wrote: "dogs soon tore him naked, took him Home Before the other negro[es] at dark & made the dogs give him another over hauling."[50] But these were exceptional cases. Barrow believed that prospective rewards for good behavior and well-performed labor were better incentives than fear of punishment. Dinners, holidays, dances, and celebrations were common and are evidenced by a typical diary entry: "finding no Cotton to trash, sent for the Fiddle And made them Dance from 12 till dark."[51]

The ante-bellum plantation was not only the center of a fairly complete system of a staple economy; it was also the nucleus of the social life of the planter class.[52] Visiting was a popular diversion, "frollics" were indulged in, many of them impromptu, and one of these Barrow described. After having "kidnapped" a number of young ladies he

[47] The purchase of large amounts of sugar and flour was an unusual plantation expenditure.

[48] "I had rather a negro would do any thing Else than runaway," Barrow once wrote, and his punishments for this act were usually severe. Diary, October 3, 1839.

[49] *Ibid.*, September 6, 1845.

[50] *Ibid.*, November 11, 1845.

[51] *Ibid.*, January 1, 1846.

[52] The social history of the Old South is yet to be written. Much interesting material, however, is to be found in the works of Phillips, William E. Dodd, Susan D. Smedes, and others. An excellent work for North Carolina is Guion G. Johnson, *Ante-Bellum North Carolina, A Social History* (Chapel Hill, 1937).

"Would not Let any Leave—got a violin player from Town . . . Let them rest & knap during the day some times. playing smut—at dark began to dance . . . never have seen A collection so sudden[ly] and so perfectly free easy & happy for two days & nights, All restraint thrown aside never enjoyed myself as much."[53] On occasion formal balls were attended, horseback rides and drives were common, and practical joking was enjoyed by all. Hunting was a popular sport. The hounds were followed as in Maryland or Virginia, and in addition deer, bear, raccoon, opossum, alligators, and wild fowl were hunted by torchlight, on horseback, and in parties by "standing."[54] Radcliff's Lake, Big and Little Bayou Sara creeks offered sport for the followers of Izaak Walton.[55]

From the beginning of his career until 1840 Barrow was one of the most prominent racing men of his parish and state.[56] He was the second largest stockholder in the St. Francisville Race Track until he sold his interests to Daniel Turnbull of Rosedown plantation.[57] He was a familiar figure at the New Orleans tracks and for a time was an official timer at the Louisiana Jockey Club.[58] He ordinarily bet small sums and often won.[59] In his racing activities he was associated with his brother, William R. Barrow, and together they developed two horses, Fanny Bell and Josh Bell, who became well known throughout the South.[60]

[53] Diary, January 7, 8, 1842.

[54] For an excellent contemporary account of hunting in this section of Louisiana, see T. B. Thorpe [Tom Owen, the Bee Hunter], "Sporting in Louisiana," in *Spirit of the Times* (New York, 1831-1861), XI (1841), 571. Of Thorpe the editor wrote, "His communications are sought after with the avidity of a Pete Whetstone, a Cypress, a Shingle Splitter, or a Snaffle." *Ibid.*, 385.

[55] The Barrow family had a steamer, the *Nimrod,* which was used for fishing and hunting excursions. See *ibid.*, 331, for an account of its first hunting trip. In the years following 1841 it is mentioned frequently.

[56] Speaking of "the Messrs. Barrow" and several other racing enthusiasts of the state, one correspondent of the *Spirit of the Times* wrote, "On such men, and their example and influence, depends the turf in the future . . . and without such support, the sooner it goes down the better." *Ibid.*, IX (1839), 405.

[57] Notarial Records, I, 192-93. Barrow sold his interest on March 13, 1840.

[58] *Spirit of the Times,* VIII (1838), 364.

[59] Diary, November 30, December 20, 1838; Barrow Accounts, 1842, 1843.

[60] Diary, May 5, 1838; April 2, 1839; July 23, 1845; Barrow Accounts, 1839, 1843; *Spirit of the Times,* VIII (1838), 28, 39, 60, 356-57, 364; XII (1842), 534.

Concerning the latter horse Barrow once wrote, "I believe Jos Bell is the Best Horse in the United States—First rate any distance."[61]

The personal life of Barrow was similar to that of men of his station in the parish of West Feliciana and in other sections of the South. Optimistic though he was, the fertile lands of Texas and Mississippi continually beckoned;[62] his indebtedness was a source of worry, and yet extravagant purchases were not infrequent; though satisfied with the organization of his plantation he would write, "am perfectly disgusted with evry thing on the place."[63] He confided to his diary his private opinion of relatives, friends, and neighbors. The whole Barrow family, with only two exceptions, he remarked, were "liberal & honest, and are like familes ought to be. united,"[64] but on another occasion, wrote: "Ruffins trainer Mr. Tisdale returned from Kentucky—bringing with him 19 beautifull dogs 5 intended for me lost or died—strange that only *mine* should have died."[65] Of one of his neighbors he said: "a meaner man never lived";[66] and concerning another individual, "A Mr Vidall staid . . . with me last night a perfect Jack ass Fop & *gawk.*"[67] He was critical of people from the North and during the visit of two "D. Yankees." noted especially "the impudence of their section of the country," finally giving them a "hint to Leave that no southernor would mistake—ordered their horses Back."[68] His endorsing troubles led him to write, "sincerely wish evry rascal & persons causing me to be in Debt in Hell *riding a red hot iron.*"[69]

[61] Diary, February 15, 1839. The *Spirit of the Times,* XII (1842), 534, carried the following: "Josh Bell was one of the best horses of his year. In March, 1839, he beat Wagner the 1st heat in a four miles race at New Orleans on the Eclipse Course; the next week he walked over for a purse of $1,500, Three mile heats, on the Louisiana Course, and in the following week won a purse of $1,200 at Three mile heats on the Metairie Course."

[62] Diary, February 19, September 8, 1841.

[63] *Ibid.,* May 5, 20, 1844.

[64] *Ibid.,* March 11, 1840.

[65] *Ibid.,* October 19, 1839.

[66] *Ibid.,* July 2, 1840.

[67] *Ibid.,* October 10, 1839.

[68] *Ibid.,* April 26, 1843; February 26, 1844.

[69] *Ibid.,* May 5, 1844. On January 1, 1840, he wrote: "My course will be a Lesson to my children—that is never to loan What is not your own—if you owe any thing pay it first—I borrowed money for other persons 'friend' & now have to pay it over. Mind Who

Mildly interested in national politics, only three issues caused him real concern: corruption in public office, the annexation of Texas, and the slavery question. He was normally a Whig but bolted the party in 1844 to vote for Polk. In state politics party lines meant little to him, and he jumped from candidate to candidate with alacrity and abandon. He held to the democratic view that the holding of office was a public duty and during the period from 1833 to 1846 was overseer of his road district, overseer of the poor, and member of the Grand Jury and the Police Jury. The Police Jury's records indicate, however, that he was not regular in attendance, for he was fined on several occasions for failure to attend meetings.[70] His cultural life was typical. He subscribed to newspapers and magazines, he bought books, attended concerts, invited artists to his country estate, had his portrait painted by Tom Thorpe, the noted "Bee Hunter,"[71] gave his children dancing lessons, and hired tutors for their private instruction. His parlor boasted several musical instruments; his newspaper shelf held the Charleston *Mercury,* the Woodville *Republican,* the *Spirit of the Times,* and other publications; and on his book shelves were Botta's *Washington* and Johnson's *Life of Henry Clay.* He attended church infrequently and was inclined to indulge in outbursts against wearers of the cloth, but contributed liberally to churches and to charity. His own personal code is indicated by two entries: "A Harralson died yesterday I shall loose by him $1300. his family will be dependent on a negro woman I have a mortgage on—as a matter of course—cannot take her";[72] and on another occasion, "so far have never injured any human being to my knowledge."[73]

A sharply realistic view of the personality of Bennet H. Barrow will

proffesses to be your friend—you see a man working hard & economising help him, but see a fellow dressing fine, using fine language & they are What is called clever fellows—let them pass."

[70] *Ibid.,* December 7, 1836; May 8, June 3, 1844; June 2, September 27, December 1, 1845; West Feliciana Parish, Minutes of the Police Jury, II, 88, 90, 91, 92, 103, 104, 106, 107, 109, 111; West Feliciana Parish, Records of the Police Jury, II, 4, 48, 72, 101, 122.

[71] Diary, May 4, 1841; May 7, 1842; Barrow Accounts, 1841.

[72] Diary, October 8, 1839.

[73] *Ibid.,* April 20, 1845.

never be sketched. He related his story briefly, sketchily, but on the whole accurately, in his diary. Frequently he interjected intimate details, each one small but in the aggregate extremely helpful for those of us who find the essence of history in human touches not ordinarily incorporated in secondary works, and revelatory of neglected elements of objective history. On September 22, 1836, he wrote: "Here I am sitting with the Baby in my lap . . . Emily criticising the History of Georgia —Caroline and John at all kinds of Mischief," and, again, on August 23 of the following year, "Attempting to learn James & John their book—had rather drive a team of mules . . . John looks one way & thinks another." Thus the common vexations of humanity beset even Bennet H. Barrow, planter of Old Feliciana.

John M. Berrien and the Administration of Andrew Jackson

By THOMAS P. GOVAN

John M. Berrien of Georgia, attorney general in the first cabinet of Andrew Jackson, was not among the dominant figures of that administration. Yet he played a vital part in it despite the fact that he was not interested in the political advancement of Martin Van Buren or John C. Calhoun, and was friendly to the Bank of the United States. The emphasis that has been placed on these two phases of the administration, while correct from the point of view of the general historian, has resulted in some distortion and in a misinterpretation of the actions and opinions of many of the lesser figures of that period. This has been particularly true in the case of Berrien, who before 1824 and after 1833 was a political opponent of Jackson, yet whose participation in the administration as a cabinet officer was entirely natural in view of the political situation and interests of his state.

One of the principal reasons for the virtual unanimity of the support for Jackson in Georgia, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi[1] was the widespread hostility to the Indian policy of President Adams. This was particularly true in Georgia where the refusal of the President and his secretary of war, James Barbour, to force the removal of the Creek Indians had nearly precipitated an armed encounter between the militia of the state and the United States army.[2] Jackson, on the other hand, was committed to an Indian policy favorable to the states of the South and

[1] Georgia: Jackson, 19,363 votes; Adams, none. Tennessee: Jackson, 44,293; Adams, 2,240. Alabama: Jackson, 17,138; Adams, 1,938. Mississippi: Jackson, 6,772; Adams, 1,581. Edward Stanwood, *A History of the Presidency,* 2 vols. (Boston, 1928), I, 148.

[2] Ulrich B. Phillips, *Georgia and State Rights* (Washington, 1902), 55-65.

West. As early as 1820 he had attempted to persuade John C. Calhoun, secretary of war in the Monroe cabinet, that the Indians of the Southwest should be forced to give up their lands in exchange for an equal area west of the Mississippi.[3] He never departed from his belief in the wisdom of this solution of the Indian problem. No other policy was closer to his heart, and none received a larger share of his personal attention during his entire administration. In fact, it was largely because of this question that he insisted on having one of two personal friends and fellow Tennesseans, Hugh L. White or John H. Eaton (the one finally selected), as secretary of war.[4]

Berrien along with most of the people of Georgia agreed with this policy of Jackson. He had been closely identified with the attempt by Georgia to force the administrations of Monroe and Adams to fulfill the agreement of 1802 between the United States and Georgia and remove both the Creek and Cherokee Indians from the state.[5] And it is probable that it was this connection with the Indian question that caused Eaton to recommend that Berrien be offered the place of attorney general and Jackson to consent to it.[6] Both of them knew that Berrien, as a Georgian, would support them in their efforts to remove the Indians not only

[3] Andrew Jackson to John C. Calhoun, September 2, 1820, in John S. Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson,* 6 vols. (Washington, 1926-1935), III, 31-32.

[4] *Id., The Life of Andrew Jackson* (New York, 1925), 413-14, 687; John C. Fitzpatrick (ed.), *The Autobiography of Martin Van Buren,* in American Historical Association, *Annual Report,* 1918, II (Washington, 1920), 312.

[5] Berrien as a member of the Georgia legislature had prepared a report demanding the immediate removal of the Creek and Cherokee Indians, and condemning President Monroe and Secretary Calhoun for their neglect of this matter. Later as United States senator, during the administration of John Quincy Adams, he had been active in the defense of Governor George M. Troup in the bitter dispute over the refusal of President Adams to put the Treaty of Indian Springs, providing for the removal of the Creek, into effect. Berrien had also been a member of the select committee of the Senate to which was referred the President's message of 1827 threatening the use of the armed forces of the nation against Georgia. The report of this committee was conciliatory in tone, and led to the negotiation of a new treaty with the Creek, in which they agreed to give up their remaining lands in Georgia. *American State Papers* (fol. ed.), *Indian Affairs,* II, 747, 749, 869-72; *Congressional Debates,* 19 Cong., 1 Sess., 620-23 (April 22, 1826); 2 Sess., 273-74, 498 (February 5, March 1, 1827).

[6] Louis McLane to Martin Van Buren, February 19, 1829; Jackson to *id.,* August 8, 1831, Van Buren MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); Jackson's Case against Calhoun, February, 1831, in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson,* IV, 235; Memorandum in Jackson's handwriting, September, 1831 (?), *ibid.,* 343.

with his talent as a lawyer, but also because he whole-heartedly sympathized with the aims of this policy which was of vital interest to his state.

During the two years of his association with the Jackson administration Berrien was called on to deliver only one formal opinion on an Indian question,[7] but he seems to have been a close and active adviser on all phases of the problem. In June, 1830, when Jackson left Washington for the summer, he gave a letter to Berrien, which said:

> As I am about to be absent from the seat of government, and circumstances may render it proper for you to proceed to Georgia, or to the Creek or Cherokee nation during the interval, I have thought it proper to put you in [possession?] in proper form of the authority under which you will act. Having conversed with you fully on the subjects connected with the relations of the government of the United States with the State of Georgia and those tribes, you will be able to [explain?] my views to the constitutional authorities of that state, and to the chief warriors of the tribes. . . . In the meantime this letter will serve to evidence to those with whom you may have occasion to transact any business connected with these subjects that you are acting with my approbation and under my authority.[8]

Berrien also acted as an intermediary between the President and Governor George R. Gilmer of Georgia, aiding both in the carrying out of their common endeavor to force the removal of the Cherokee from northern Georgia.[9] He apparently made two trips to the Indian country at the request of President Jackson, and was absent on one of these missions in the spring of 1831 when Van Buren and Eaton resigned from the cabinet.[10]

Berrien, however, aside from his connection with the Indian policy, seems to have had little influence in the administration. He carried on the work of his department, but his views on general measures apparently were of no effect. At this time he was opposed to the tariff both as

[7] Benjamin F. Hall (comp.), *Official Opinions of the Attorney General of the United States,* 2 vols. (Washington, 1852), II, 321-29.

[8] Jackson to Berrien, June 16, 1830, Berrien MSS. (in possession of Mrs. Rosa Burroughs, Savannah, Georgia).

[9] Gilmer to *id.,* February 8, 1830, *ibid.; id.* to *id.,* May 6, 1830, May 17, 1831, in George R. Gilmer, *Sketches of Some of the First Settlers of Upper Georgia, of the Cherokees and the Author* (New York, 1855), 340-41, 398-99.

[10] Macon *Georgia Telegraph,* April 27, 1831; Milledgeville *Southern Recorder,* May 19, 1831; Francis Scott Key to Roger B. Taney, June 14, 1831, in Samuel Tyler, *Memoir of Roger Brooke Taney, L.L.D.* (Baltimore, 1872), 168-71.

a principle and a policy, and was in favor of the continuance of the Bank of the United States. He made no attempt to conceal his views on these questions, and as late as April, 1831, the cashier of the Savannah branch of the Bank of the United States wrote of him to Nicholas Biddle, "I had much pleasure in meeting with my friend Mr. Berrien at Milledgeville—He is decidedly in favor of the Bank of the United States, and his opinions here had their influence."[11]

Neither Jackson nor Eaton made any attempt to ascertain Berrien's views on this or any other subject before inviting him to join the cabinet,[12] and his opinions on public questions seem to have had no influence on his dismissal from it. He had for many years been employed as an attorney for the Savannah branch of the Bank, and in February, 1829, had been retained to represent the Bank in a pending controversy with the state banks of Georgia.[13] When Jackson was preparing his initial message to Congress, he requested Berrien to supply him with an informal opinion as to the constitutionality of the Bank. Berrien replied and urged the President not to raise the question at that particular time, since he was not called on to perform any act concerning the Bank's charter during his elected term. The Attorney General did not expressly affirm his own belief in the constitutionality of the Bank, but informed the President that the existence of his power had been affirmed at various times and in different forms by every department of the government. He then added:

If this power is not granted by the Constitution, it is very certain, that no series of usurpations can give it a legitimate existence in that instrument. Since however an ins[ti]tution now exists, which results from the exercise of that power, it seems to me that the question of constitutional power may be wisely left to rest on the footing on which anterior decisions have placed it, so far as the Executive department is concerned, until that department shall be called on to do some act, which will necessarily raise this question. If this view of the subject should not accord with the determinations of the President, the attorney General will cheer-

[11] James Hunter to Nicholas Biddle, April 23, 1831, Biddle MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

[12] Berrien to Eaton, July 29, 1831, Berrien MSS.

[13] Biddle to Leslie Coombs, April 25, 1827; *id.* to John Sergeant, January 5, 1829; *id.* to George B. Cumming, February 10, 1829, Biddle MSS.

fully submit his opinion on the question of constitutional power, whenever it shall be desired.[14]

His formal opinion on the Bank was never requested, and he left the cabinet before the active controversy between the administration and the Bank began.

Berrien also refrained from any participation in the rivalry between the partisans of Calhoun and Van Buren.[15] He had been a political supporter and close friend of William H. Crawford and shared the latter's dislike and distrust of Calhoun. In addition, as a Georgian, he had resented Calhoun's apparent reluctance to force the Indians out of Georgia when the South Carolinian had been in charge of Indian affairs during the Monroe administration.[16] Neither Calhoun nor any of the South Carolinians, Robert Y. Hayne, William Drayton, George McDuffie, and James Hamilton, Jr., who were consulted by Jackson prior to the formation of the cabinet, had anything to do with the selection of Berrien as attorney general.[17] In fact the appointment was bitterly resented by Calhoun's friends of the Clarke party in Georgia, one of whom wrote Jackson warning him that he was taking into his cabinet a man who had, as

[14] Berrien to Jackson, November 27, 1829, in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson,* IV, 94-95.

[15] Public letter of Berrien, in Washington *National Intelligencer,* July 23, 1831, quoted in *Niles' Weekly Register* (Baltimore, 1811-1849), XL (1831), 380-81; Milledgeville *Southern Recorder,* August 4, 1831.

[16] In this connection it should be noted that Calhoun had received only two of Georgia's nine votes in the electoral college as a result of the opposition of the Crawford-Troup party of which Berrien was a member.

[17] James Hamilton, Jr., to Van Buren, January 23, February 19, 1829; Robert Y. Hayne to *id.,* February 14, 1829, Van Buren MSS. The influence of Calhoun on the formation of the cabinet has frequently been exaggerated. Calhoun, himself, in the fall of 1831, said, "General Jackson never consulted me as to the formation of his cabinet." Richard K. Crallé (ed.), *The Works of John C. Calhoun,* 6 vols. (New York, 1855), VI, 443. James A. Hamilton, Van Buren's personal representative in Washington, on February 18, 1829, wrote, "The Calhoun influence . . . is not however very great." And on February 21 he quoted Major William B. Lewis as saying that the cabinet was "decidedly friendly to V.B.," and added his own statement, "be assured Calhoun is disappointed." James A. Hamilton to Van Buren, February 18, 21, 1829, Van Buren MSS. The only political associate of Calhoun appointed to the cabinet was Samuel D. Ingham of Pennsylvania, and this appointment was disappointing to Calhoun's friends, James Hamilton, Jr., and Hayne, who desired either Langdon Cheves, former president of the Bank of the United States, or Louis McLane of Delaware, for the treasury. James Hamilton, Jr., to Van Buren, February 19, 1829, Van Buren MSS.

a member of the Crawford-Troup party, participated in the virulent attacks on Calhoun and Jackson prior to 1824, and who had supported Jackson in 1828 only "as an alternative," after Crawford's defeat and disability had destroyed the possibility of his elevation to the presidency.[18]

As a follower of Crawford, Berrien had been associated with Van Buren, who had also supported the Georgian in 1824. After the defeat of Crawford both Van Buren and Berrien had gone over to the Jackson party, and had co-operated in opposition to the policies of President Adams in the Senate. But in spite of these political associations the two men were never intimate and their intercourse was largely limited to official matters.[19] Van Buren's choice for the position of attorney general had been Louis McLane of Delaware. He was surprised by the selection of Berrien, and neither he nor any of his supporters had anything to do with the appointment.[20] Some of them, at any rate, looked with disfavor on Berrien from the beginning. They knew he was not an intimate friend nor a political associate of Calhoun, but he was not committed to Van Buren, which, to them, was just as bad. For as Churchill C. Cambreleng, one of them, in a letter to Van Buren, wrote:

We now know our enemies, and our motto should be those who are not with us are against us, we shall now have, what was at one time feared we should not have, a party administration and it must be governed by party principles—and if

[18] Tomlinson Fort to Jackson, June 1, 1829, Fort MSS. (Chattanooga Public Library). Cf. Thomas W. Cobb to Charles Tait, March 8, 1822, Tait MSS. (Alabama Department of Archives and History); Gilmer to Monroe, May 20, 1822, in Gilmer, *Sketches of Some of of the First Settlers of Upper Georgia,* 288-91; public letter of Wilson Lumpkin in reply to William H. Crawford, in the Milledgeville *Georgia Journal,* 1831, quoted in Wilson Lumpkin, *The Removal of the Cherokee Indians from Georgia,* 2 vols. (New York, 1907), II, 296-300.

[19] Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Autobiography of Martin Van Buren,* 213-14, 216.

[20] Van Buren to James A. Hamilton, dated February 2, 1829, but obviously written after February 19, in James A. Hamilton, *Reminiscences of Hamilton, or Men and Events at Home and Abroad during Three Quarters of a Century* (New York, 1869), 91; Van Buren to Churchill C. Cambreleng, December 17, 1828; James A. Hamilton to Van Buren, February 18, 1829, Van Buren MSS. When Berrien was offered the post of minister to England at the recommendation of Littleton W. Tazewell on April 6, 1829, Van Buren persuaded Jackson to offer the place as attorney general to Louis McLane. Berrien, however, refused the ministry, which was then offered to McLane who accepted it. Jackson to Berrien, April 6, 1829, Berrien MSS.; McLane to Van Buren, April 15, 1829, Van Buren MSS.; Berrien to Jackson, April 9, 1829, Jackson MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); James A. Hamilton, *Reminiscences,* 130-31.

the Post-Master and the Atty-General do not accord in that sentiment there are others equally able and meritorious who will.[21]

Berrien's situation between the conflicting ambitions of Van Buren and Calhoun was further complicated by local political controversies in Georgia. Both parties in the state had supported Jackson in 1828, but old rivalries were renewed the following year in the gubernatorial campaign. Two candidates were brought forward by different factions of the Troup-Crawford party as a result of a personal quarrel between Gilmer and John Forsyth. The Clarke party did not name a candidate but supported Gilmer in opposition to Joel Crawford, the nominee of the Forsyth-Crawford faction of the Troup party, and Gilmer was elected.[22] There is no evidence that Berrien took any part in this campaign. He was apparently friendly to both factions. Both fully supported the Jackson administration, particularly in regard to the Indian question, in which Berrien was actively concerned.

The existence of this split in his party, however, was an additional reason for him to refrain from any interference in the quarrel between the supporters of Van Buren and Calhoun. William H. Crawford and Forsyth were among those who had informed Jackson of Calhoun's attitude toward his conduct of the Seminole War. This revelation was the immediate cause of the open rupture between Calhoun and Jackson and was largely responsible for the complete triumph of the supporters of Van Buren. Berrien did not like Van Buren, but if he had gone over to Calhoun he would have alienated Forsyth and Crawford and would have had to ally himself with the Clarke party, among whose members the friends of Calhoun in Georgia were to be found. Yet, if he had openly joined the partisans of Van Buren and tied himself closely to Forsyth and Crawford, he would have had to break with Governor Gilmer with whom he had been intimately associated. For these reasons he did nothing.

When the quarrel between Jackson and Calhoun was brought out into

[21] Cambreleng to Van Buren, March 1, 1829, Van Buren MSS. Cf. James A. Hamilton, *Reminiscences,* 130-31.

[22] Gilmer to Fort, August 27, 1829, Fort MSS.; Gilmer, *Sketches of Some of the First Settlers of Upper Georgia,* 310-11, 316-17, 566; Phillips, *Georgia and State Rights,* 110-11.

the open, Berrien, according to his own statement, "studiously avoided all interference, except to deprecate Mr. Calhoun's publication," because of "the connection of Mr. Crawford with this controversy, and my own relation to gen. Jackson."[23] No attempt was made to connect Berrien with Calhoun in the early stages of the controversy. It was only after the dissolution of the cabinet and Berrien's publication of his correspondence with Eaton that any such connection was charged. Jackson first made the direct accusation in a private letter to David Burford of Tennessee on July 28, 1831, and it was publicly repeated by Eaton in a letter published in September, 1831.[24] To this Berrien immediately replied on September 23: "The charge that I was at any time the partisan of Mr. Calhoun, is utterly destitute of foundation. Mr. Eaton cannot impute to me any act or expression which will give the slightest countenance to this assertion."[25] Calhoun also replied to Eaton's letter. He, unlike Berrien, had no imperative political reason for denying any political relation between them, and he made no attempt to deny the accuracy of Eaton's designation of Samuel D. Ingham, secretary of the treasury, as his friend and supporter. It is therefore significant that Calhoun called attention to the misstatement of Eaton that John Branch, secretary of the navy, and Berrien were also political associates of the Vice-President as evidence of the unreliability of other statements in Eaton's letter.[26]

Despite these denials by both Calhoun and Berrien of any political relations between them, the charges were repeated, and have been accepted by almost all of the writers on the Jackson administration. This

[23] Public letter of Berrien, *Niles' Weekly Register,* XL (1831), 381.

[24] Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson,* IV, 318-19; *Niles' Weekly Register,* XLI (1831), 50, 55-56, 60-62.

[25] *Niles' Weekly Register,* XLI (1831), 81.

[26] Crallé (ed.), *Works of John C. Calhoun,* VI, 442. In this regard an extract from a letter of Berrien to Gilmer on February 3, 1855, when both were old men and retired from politics, is of interest. Gilmer in his rambling autobiography, *Sketches of Some of the First Settlers of Upper Georgia,* 463-65, had stated that Berrien had been an adherent of Calhoun. Berrien wrote to him: "The second remark to which I have reference represents me as a *nullifier,* and *adherent* of Mr. Calhoun. This is a mistake. . . . I was never among the 'adherents' of Mr. Calhoun. Our private relations were kind, but never intimate, and politically we were almost always opposed." Berrien MSS. In Gilmer's own copy of his book (now in the Emory University Library) which he revised for a new edition that was never published, this reference to Berrien is stricken out. Berrien was, of course, an old man at

has resulted from the simultaneous development of Jackson's controversy with Calhoun, and his quarrel with Ingham, Branch, and Berrien over the refusal of them and their families to entertain the wife of the Secretary of War. These unrelated episodes were both skillfully exploited by those who desired the elevation of Van Buren and the defeat of Calhoun, and Jackson was convinced, or convinced himself, that there was a direct and immediate connection between the two. That is, that the refusal of the families of Berrien, Branch, and Ingham to associate with Mrs. Eaton was a plot directed by Calhoun to force one of his opponents, Eaton, out of the cabinet.

This belief apparently has no basis in fact so far as Berrien was concerned.[27] He and Calhoun were almost always opposed to each other in politics. There are no letters between them in either of the published collections of Calhoun correspondence, and none in the Berrien papers. They were both opposed to the tariff and both their families refused to associate with Mrs. Eaton, but this coincidence is not sufficient to prove that they were political associates. There is no evidence that either was, at any time, interested in the political advancement of the other; in fact, Berrien was always opposed to those men in Georgia who desired the election of Calhoun to the presidency.

At the time of the dissolution of the cabinet Van Buren himself was not sure that Berrien was to be included among those whose resignations were to be requested.[28] Berrien was absent in Georgia on business connected with the Indians when the other members of the cabinet resigned. Edward Livingston, Levi Woodbury, Francis Scott Key, and Roger B. Taney, all to be closely associated with Jackson in his reorganized administration, were anxious that Berrien should be retained, as

this time, and his memory about specific events or happenings might be questioned, but it seems doubtful if he would make an error about the persons with whom he had or had not been politically associated.

[27] The writer has no concern here with whether there was ever a plot by any group to force Eaton out of the cabinet. In his opinion, however, the whole affair was purely social. It was directed entirely to the exclusion of Mrs. Eaton from society and was connected with politics only to the extent that it was used by the supporters of Van Buren.

[28] Benjamin F. Butler to Van Buren, April 22, 1831, Van Buren MSS.; *id.* to James A. Hamilton, April 25, 1831, in Hamilton, *Reminiscences,* 213-14.

they believed that his retention in the cabinet would be positive proof that the dissolution had not been caused by the Eaton affair.[29] Key was the only one who felt free to mention the subject to Jackson. The President, however, decisively rejected the suggestion, saying that Berrien's resignation "was a necessary part of the arrangement he had been compelled to make, and was understood as such, and that he could not go back from it."[30]

Berrien probably would have been willing to remain in the cabinet. He knew that General Jackson's popularity was as great as ever in Georgia. His eulogy of Jackson and praise of his just and firm course in Indian affairs, delivered at a testimonial dinner to Berrien given by his friends in Savannah, had been well received in Georgia. He had just returned from the Indian country and he believed that a final solution of the whole controversy was to be arrived at in the course of a few months.[31] It was only natural that he should want to be a participant in the triumphant end of a policy so popular in his own state and in which he had played so prominent a part. But he knew that it could not be. While in Savannah Berrien had received letters from Ingham stating that Jackson had expressly mentioned him as one of those who had to go.[32] So when Key told him that it was not necessary for him to resign from the cabinet, "and that it would gratify some of the General's friends if he could be retained," Berrien merely indicated his belief that Van Buren "would have required that he should be included in the arrangement."[33]

Berrien resigned on June 15. His resignation letter and its acknowledgement from the President were friendly in tone. He continued in his office until June 21 in order to prepare it for the reception of his successor. He then sent a brief note informing the President that he was ready to withdraw, and requesting Jackson's permission to publish the corre-

[29] Key to Taney, June 14, 1831, in Tyler, *Memoir of Taney,* 168-70; Milledgeville *Southern Recorder,* May 12, 1831; Macon *Georgia Messenger,* June 18, 1831.

[30] Key to Taney, June 14, 1831, in Tyler, *Memoir of Taney,* 169-70.

[31] *Ibid.,* 169; Milledgeville *Southern Recorder,* May 19, 1831.

[32] Ingham to Berrien, April 19, 20, 1831, Berrien MSS.

[33] Key to Taney, June 14, 1831, in Tyler, *Memoir of Taney,* 168.

spondence between them, because of the misunderstanding which had been circulated in the newspapers on the subject of his retirement from office.[34] This was granted. The correspondence appeared in due time and John Quincy Adams, writing in his diary, observed that Berrien was not only the single member of the cabinet that had gone out with dignity, but that he had also "treated the laws of grammar with some respect."

For a few weeks Berrien refrained from any participation in the public disputes between Eaton and the other members of the cabinet. Eaton addressed a note to him on June 17 enclosing a clipping from the Washington *Telegraph* that said, "it is proved that the Secretaries of the Treasury and of the Navy and the Attorney General refused to associate with her [Mrs. Eaton]." In his note Eaton said: "This publication appears in a paper which professes to be friendly to you & is brought forth under your immediate eye. I desire to know of you, whether or not you sanction this statement or disavow it. The relation we have sustained towards each other authorizes me to demand an immediate answer."[35] Berrien replied the next day and denied the right of Eaton to interrogate him concerning the statements of the *Telegraph* or any other public journal which were made without his agency. Though denying Eaton's right, he wrote, he would not refuse to answer his inquiry, and thereupon Berrien gave a full account of his social relations with the Secretary of War and his wife.

At the time of Eaton's marriage, Berrien stated, he had not heard the rumors concerning Mrs. Eaton, nor had he known her relation to Washington society. He had been invited to the wedding and had attended with no distrust of the propriety of doing so. Later he learned of the allegations made against Mrs. Eaton, as they had become publicly and generally known, and it became necessary, even though embarrassing, for Berrien to determine his future conduct in view of the official relations existing between him and Major Eaton. In doing this, Berrien said, it did not seem to him necessary to decide on the truth or falsity of

[34] Berrien to Jackson, June 15, 21, 1831; Jackson to Berrien, June 15, 2, 1831, Berrien MSS.

[35] Eaton to Berrien, June 17, 1831, *ibid.*

these rumors. It was sufficient to ascertain the general sense of the community and act upon it. He had done so, and in the winter of 1830 he had been called upon by a gentleman (Richard M. Johnson of Kentucky), who had represented himself as acting upon the authority of the President. This gentleman had announced the regret that General Jackson felt at the lack of harmony or of social intercourse among the members of the cabinet, and his determination to have it. The fact had been distinctly stated to Berrien that he, Branch, and Ingham had all given large parties to which Mrs. Eaton was not invited, and he was told that in the future on such occasions the President would expect social intercourse among their families. Berrien replied that he would not permit the President or any other individual to dictate the social relations of himself or his family, and that if such a requisition were persisted in, he would retire from his official position.[86] The President, however, according to Berrien, in an interview a few days later disclaimed any disposition to press such a requisition, and Berrien closed his letter to Eaton with the statement, "I am not aware that any other occasion has occurred in which the question of an intercourse between your family and mine has been presented to me or my family."[87]

Eaton replied to Berrien four days later: "I felt indisposed to believe that these attacks of General Green could be authorized by you or were under your sanction. Your declaration is evidence of the correctness of what I was before impressed with. I take occasion, therefore, with pleasure to acknowledge the frankness with which you have disavowed an agency in this nefarious business."[88] Jackson at the same time commented on this letter to both of his nephews from whom there was cer-

[86] Berrien could easily have resigned at this particular time, the winter of 1830, as George M. Troup, United States senator from Georgia, was anxious to resign his place and have Berrien succeed him. Berrien, however, advised against this, because he and other Georgians felt that at the particular stage of the Indian controversy the interests of Georgia could be better served by Troup remaining in the Senate and Berrien in the cabinet. Troup to Dr. W. C. Daniell, March 4, 1830, in Edward J. Harden, *The Life of George M. Troup* (Savannah, 1859), 508; Gilmer to Berrien, February 8, 1830, Berrien MSS.; Duff Green to Pemberton, editor of the Augusta *Chronicle,* August 5, 1831, Duff Green MSS. (This and other letters from the Duff Green MSS., owned by Miss Carrie Green, are used with the kind permission of Professor Fletcher M. Green.)

[87] Berrien to Eaton, June 18, 1831, in *Niles' Weekly Register,* XL (1831), 381-82.

[88] Eaton to Berrien, June 22, 1831, Berrien MSS.

tainly no need to conceal his true views concerning it. To Andrew Jackson, Jr., he wrote, "Judge Berrien has acted like a gentleman, and when his correspondence & Ingham's with Major Eaton are published the contrast will be damnation to Ingham and credit to Judge Berrien." And in a letter to Andrew Jackson Donelson, he said, "judge Berrien in his correspondence with Eaton has acted like a gentleman and left mr Ingham in rather a disagreeable situation."[39]

Jackson did not change his opinion of Berrien's letter until July 19, although on July 11 he wrote to Van Buren that it was "a deep, *considered,* diplomatic letter."[40] On July 19, however, the Washington *Globe,* the administration paper, quoted a letter from Richard M. Johnson to Berrien which denied that Jackson had made any attempt to control the social intercourse of the members of his cabinet, or that he had authorized Colonel Johnson to make any such representation to them. Berrien seemed to feel that the article accompanying this quotation, which was confusingly written, indicated that he had also denied that the President had made any such attempt. He thereupon wrote a letter to Francis P. Blair, editor of the *Globe,* on the same day. He stated that he did not wish to enter into the controversy, nor did he believe that Colonel Johnson wanted to do so, but he indicated by implication that if he were forced into the public dispute that he would uphold the contentions of Branch and Ingham and of his original letter to Eaton.[41] It was on this same day that Jackson wrote to Eaton, seemingly for the benefit of the record as they were both in Washington, a letter which said:

I have perused the note of judge Berrien to you (major Eaton) of the 18th of June and I regret, as he has referred to an interview with the President, that he has not given a fair statement, that you might understand (or if for publication) the public might understand it. first then I have to state, and do it without fear of contradiction that no member of Congress was by me ever authorised to say that Judge Berrien, Mr Ingham and Branch, with their families should associate with major Eaton and his or they should be removed. . . . all I wanted was har-

[39] Jackson to Andrew Jackson, Jr., June 23, 1831, Jackson MSS.; *id.* to Andrew J. Donelson, June 23, 1831, in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson,* IV, 303.

[40] *Id.* to Van Buren, July 11, 1831, in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson,* IV, 313.

[41] Berrien to Francis P. Blair, July 19, 1831, Berrien MSS. The whole correspondence was printed in *Niles' Weekly Register,* XL (1831), 375-79.

mony in my Cabinet, that he and all others might rest assured that I never would part with major Eaton nor should he be drove out of my Cabinet by any combination that could or might be formed for that purpose, that I would remove the whole first—again it was repeated by the Gentlemen that they would be the last men who would do any act with a design, or knowledge, that it would injure major Eaton or his family—here the matter was left.[42]

There is no need to enter here into a discussion of the long series of charges and countercharges that were made by Blair, Eaton, Johnson, and Jackson on the one side, and by Berrien, Branch, and Ingham on the other, nor to review the long correspondence that resulted from Eaton's challenge to Berrien on July 28, 1831. It is sufficient to say that both sides denied the truth of the assertions made by the other, and that it is impossible to ascertain which, if either, was correct. Berrien, however, did confine his public letters to an elaboration of his original letter to Eaton and the substantiation of it by corroborating evidence; and the fact that neither Jackson nor Eaton objected at the immediate time that the first statement of his position was received is an indication, at least, that there may have been some truth in it.

Berrien's personal break with the President was complete, but the question of his political affiliation was still unsettled. Jackson's popularity in Georgia was as great as ever, and the Troup and Clarke parties were vying with each other in their expressions of loyalty to the President in the gubernatorial campaign of 1831. Richard W. Habersham, close friend and political associate of Berrien, wrote him:

I have since I had the pleasure of seeing you in Savannah watched with a painful interest the course of events at Washington, for I apprehended that they must result in forcing you into the attitude into which you have been compelled to place yourself with regard to the President, an attitude which I knew would be harmful to you, and which would tend partly to increase the divisions and distractions of the great Southern party. I foresaw too, that under present [circumstances?] Georgia could not and would not take part with you, whatever might be the feeling of the [majority?] of her people towards you individually. The great body of the people of this State are devoted to the President for his course

[42] Jackson to Eaton, in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, IV, 163-64. This letter is filed in the Jackson MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress), under the date of July 19, 1830, and is so dated by Bassett, but as it refers to Berrien's letter of June 18, 1831, there can be no doubt that it was written on July 19, 1831.

in relation to the Indians and Indian lands, the acts of his administration whether as they regard to our domestic or foreign relations have been generally approved and that approbation has been loudly and often expressed in all our journals. Any opposition which should now show itself would be compelled (to relieve itself of inconsistency) to rest itself upon the single ground of the recent dissolution of the cabinet, and in our state would be almost compelled to confine itself to the wrongs and injustice which has been done to one of our citizens. But even if opposition could show itself at another time with hope of success, it could not, if made at present, end otherwise than in the political death of all concerned. The whole state is warmly excited on the subject of the approaching elections. . . . The great weapon of either party is the charge of want of attachment to the President and of preference for Calhoun. . . . To prove the correctness of these views it is only necessary to refer to the columns of the prints throughout the State. The Troup party rest themselves on their unchanging and jealous support of the President, the Clark party claims to have been his original friends. It is evident enough to me that many of the leaders of this last party are friendly to Mr. Calhoun [whom?] they cannot touch. . . . All that can now be done . . . [is] to place you on the footing which is the fact that you have been forced into the disclosures which you have made; that . . . you did not volunteer to do the injury, but was forced in self defense and to point out as often as [opportunity?] arises the zeal with which you have devoted yourself whether in or out of office to the interests of the state and particularly your services on the Indian question.[43]

Fortunately Berrien was a delegate to the National Free Trade Convention at Philadelphia in October, 1831, and, consequently, had an excuse to remain away from Georgia and out of the gubernatorial campaign of that year. His friend Gilmer was the candidate of one faction of the Troup party for re-election, Thomas Haynes of the other faction, and Wilson Lumpkin had been nominated by the Clarke party. The always tangled political situation in Georgia was more complex than usual. All the candidates claimed to be loyal to Andrew Jackson, none more loudly than Lumpkin, a personal friend of Calhoun.[44] Haynes finally withdrew from the race in September, but the factionalism in the Troup party was not healed, and Lumpkin was elected governor.

The split in the Troup party became even wider as John Forsyth, by this time one of the most influential advisers of the Jackson administra-

[43] Richard W. Habersham to Berrien, August 3, 1831, Berrien MSS.

[44] Phillips, *Georgia and State Rights,* 125; Lumpkin, *Removal of the Cherokee Indians from Georgia,* II, 297-98.

tion, and the papers under his control, began to attack Berrien as a supporter of Calhoun and an enemy of Jackson.[45] Duff Green, anxious as always to promote the interests of Calhoun, tried to persuade the leaders of the Clarke party to take advantage of the split between Forsyth on the one hand and Gilmer and Berrien on the other. On August 5 he wrote:

> I say to you that Jackson cannot be elected. I cannot mistake your feelings, and I know enough of Judge Berrien to know that you would sustain him, if you knew all that I know. A division is about to take place in the Troup party—and by prudence you will control the state. Nothing but the pressure from the Clarke party keeps it together; and if you would permit them to quarrel you would soon find the two divisions of the old Crawford party now one. When this comes Judge Berrien, Troup and Gilmer will be on your side. Is it not wise in you to promote it?[46]

Green warned the members of the Clarke party that Jackson would ignore them, as he had in the past, and "throw himself upon Crawford, Forsyth and the Journal." If, however, the Clarke party would defend Berrien he would have to join it from hostility to Forsyth, and his strength was still sufficient to pull most of the Gilmer wing of the Troup party with him. In this way, Green said, the Clarke party would be able to dominate state politics.[47]

Green correctly saw the divisions in Georgia politics, but he underestimated the strength of Jackson's popularity. No one in the Clarke party dared to break with the President, and the Clarke papers continued to oppose both factions of the Troup party. In fact, as late as September 3, 1831, the Macon *Telegraph,* a Clarke paper, said of the Calhoun-Crawford controversy, "It is no more than one political blackleg palming a card on the other," and referred to both Berrien and Forsyth as "warm and devoted friends of Crawford."

Green was also wrong when he predicted that Berrien would not support Jackson for re-election. Berrien's knowledge of the political situation in Georgia was too great, and Habersham's warning had been too explicit, for him to dare to break politically with the administration.

[45] Green to J. A. Cuthbert, July 24, 1831, Duff Green MSS.; William H. Torrance to Berrien, August 13, 18, 1831, Berrien MSS.

[46] Green to Pemberton, editor of the Augusta *Chronicle,* August 5, 1831, Duff Green MSS.

[47] *Id* to *id.,* August 5, 1831; *id.* to Cuthbert, July 24, 1831, *ibid.*

Soon after he returned to Georgia he was invited to attend a dinner in honor of Gilmer at Milledgeville. He was called on to speak, and in reference to the dissolution of the cabinet and its aftermath, he said:

> I look to these events, rather in sorrow, as one of this people . . . than in anger as an individual. I have no private griefs to urge . . . personally I prefer no complaint. . . . In reference to the Chief Magistrate of the Union, I have no disposition to retract the sentiments which in full view of the events which speedily followed, were sometimes since expressed to my fellow citizens of Savannah. . . . On a question of public policy deeply interesting to us as a people, he has been, and is, a friend of Georgia. His conduct on that occasion entitled him to the gratitude of her people. It commanded and still commands mine.

Berrien endorsed Jackson's efforts to maintain the rights of the state and to repress undue exertion of Federal power, and approved his strong foreign policy and the economy with which he had conducted the general government. He then closed his speech with the following statement: "These measures of his administration have heretofore received and will continue to receive my cordial concurrence. . . . They will find much more able support than I can give . . . but I will yield to none in the sincerity with which I will endeavor to sustain them."[48]

Berrien took little part in the campaign of 1832 as his primary interest at the time was the question of the tariff. He, Albert Gallatin, and Langdon Cheves had been the leaders of discussion at the National Free Trade Convention, and Berrien had prepared the address of the convention to the people of the United States.[49] Upon his return to Georgia he had become one of the leaders of the antitariff movement in the state and he devoted most of his time and energy to this subject. In the summer of 1832, as was the usual custom, the leading politicians of the state gathered at Athens for the commencement exercises of the University of Georgia. A meeting was held, presided over by William H. Crawford, to consider the problem of the tariff. The organizers of the meeting were largely men of moderate views and opposed to any drastic action, but Augustine S. Clayton, Augustus B. Longstreet, and Berrien secured control of its proceedings. They decided to call a convention in Novem-

[48] Milledgeville *Southern Recorder,* November 17, 1831.
[49] *Niles' Weekly Register,* XLI (1831), 105-107, 136-41, 156-68.

ber at Milledgeville to which the counties of the state were invited to send delegates. Crawford did not entirely approve of the action of the meeting, but he signed the resolutions as presiding officer, and the call for the convention went out in his name.[50]

The Troup and Clarke parties had both nominated Andrew Jackson for re-election, and, as a result, the campaign of 1832 was receiving comparatively little attention in Georgia. The Clarke party, no longer friendly to Calhoun [51] though still hostile to Van Buren, had nominated Phillip Barbour for vice-president. Barbour, however, refused the nomination, and, consequently, both parties in Georgia were supporting the same candidates. The antitariff convention furnished them an issue, however, and the Clarke press immediately denounced the men who called it as nullifiers and opponents of Andrew Jackson. This was denied by Berrien and the other callers of the convention, who insisted that there was no connection between the convention and the opposition to Jackson.[52]

In a sense this was correct. All of these men were nominally support-

[50] Macon *Georgia Messenger,* August 9, 1832.

[51] A strange situation had developed in Georgia out of the complications of state politics, personal loyalties, national and sectional questions, and economic issues. The friends of Calhoun in Georgia, among whom, incidentally, were many of the defenders of the Bank of the United States against the state banks, were the most fervent and loyal supporters of President Jackson, and were opposed to any drastic action in regard to the tariff. They could not maintain this anomalous position long and broke with Calhoun after his open declaration in favor of nullification. This situation is clearly shown in a letter from Dr. Tomlinson Fort, president of the Central Bank of Georgia, to Calhoun on July 15, 1831, which said: "The fiery ordeal you have so triumphantly passed through in the late correspondence; the developments which have followed the dissolution of the late cabinet; the position you contemplate taking before the people in what I think a far more dangerous trial . . . operate to cause me to obtrude myself on your notice at the present time. I can hardly be mistaken in the fact that, a wide spread opinion prevails, that there is at work in South Carolina a powerful passion of disloyalty to the Government of the United States. . . . The Troup party of this state have recoiled from the consequences of maxims. Few of them daring to avow their faith in nullification. Their opponents, with whom I am classed, always loyal to the Government of the United States, are kindled into intense passion on the question. . . . I have urged on many of them the necessity of avowing our purpose of supporting you at the proper time or at least to prepare the public mind for such a course. They almost uniformly reply by asking, *is he not a nullifyer?* It will be impossible to unite them in support of anyone who is tainted with nullification. No! not even against Mr. Van buren, odious as he is." Fort MSS.

[52] Macon *Georgia Messenger,* August 27, 1832; Milledgeville *Southern Recorder,* August 30, 1832.

ing Jackson for re-election, and public sentiment in Georgia was such that if they had admitted that secretly almost all of them were desirous of the defeat of Jackson, it would have meant their political eclipse and the failure of their convention. Berrien was always very careful to distinguish between his position in regard to the tariff and the nullification doctrines of Calhoun in South Carolina. He said that he believed in measures of resistance based on the doctrine of state rights as expressed in the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, such as had been put into force by Governor Troup and the Georgia legislature in their resistance to the Federal government from 1825 to 1827. He opposed nullification, because, he said:

An exercise of the reserved right of the state by the annulment or nullification of the obnoxious law, if such a power could be deduced from the Constitution of the United States or could be considered as fairly incident to State Sovereignty, during the continuance of the confederacy, would merit consideration; but with great respect for the intelligence and the fullest confidence in the patriotism of many of those by whom it is advocated, I have been led to the conclusion that it is impracticable, and that its tendency will be to precipitate a result, which all would unite to deplore.[53]

Despite his denials of any connection with nullification, the charge was repeated, and some of Berrien's friends were convinced that his secret anxiety to prevent the re-election of General Jackson had caused him to lean even further towards nullification than he himself realized.[54] That Berrien was opposed to the re-election of Jackson is indicated by a letter of July 17, 1832, to a friend in Philadelphia:

I am advised of the Presidential veto on the Bank bills—This presents a crisis in our affairs which gives more than ordinary interest to the prospect before us—You are not ignorant of my views on this subject. The hope of a renewal of the charter is now limited to the failure of Genl Jackson's reelection or to the acquisition of such an accession of strength in Congress as will enable its friends to present a case too strong for his opposition. It would be extremely desirable, if it were practicable to obtain a favorable expression of opinion from the Legislatures of the different States—or failing this to prevent legislative instructions to the Senators. This is more important in this state, where a change in the Senatorial branch will probably occur at the next session of Congress—A very general

[53] Macon *Georgia Messenger,* October 4, 1832.
[54] Hunter to Biddle, August 6, 1832, Biddle MSS.

assemblage of persons of influence from different parts of the state, takes place at Athens in the beginning of August. . . . I have determined to go there and knowing that Col Hunter the Cashier of the Branch at this place, has considerable influence with a very powerful party in this State [the Clarke party], I have advised him to do so. . . . The object of this letter is therefore to suggest thro you to Mr. Biddle, the propriety of his giving instruction to Col. Hunter on this subject.[55]

Berrien could not let this opposition be known, for he was anxious to be the one selected to go to the Senate by the next legislature, and he continued to insist publicly that he was a supporter of Jackson.

All during August, September, and October, Berrien traveled over the state trying to arouse interest in the coming antitariff convention. The citizens of Chatham, Berrien's home county, refused to send a delegate, and he had to go to Milledgeville as the representative of Monroe, one of the newer counties of the interior of the state.[56] When the convention met on November 13, 1832, a number of moderates, led by Forsyth, attempted to obstruct the convention and prevent it from taking any action. They were defeated in this purpose, withdrew, and organized as a separate body. Judge Clayton led the small group among the remaining delegates that actually favored nullification, but the majority held approximately the same views as those advanced by Berrien, and they refused to permit the nullifiers to control the convention. Resolutions were adopted condemning the tariff and calling a convention of all the Southern states, which should consult on the proper mode of redress and then refer its action back to the people of the several states for ratification.[57]

No Southern convention was held as the whole question was settled by the compromise tariff of 1833; but the state convention was not without practical results, for it served to clarify the confused political situation in Georgia. Forsyth, Crawford, and their faction of the Troup party marched right out of the antitariff convention into the Clarke party to form the Union or administration party in Georgia. On the other hand Gilmer, Berrien, Troup, and Clayton, emboldened by the opposition in

[55] Berrien to Phillip H. Nicklin, July 17, 1832, *ibid.*

[56] Milledgeville *Southern Recorder,* November 1, 15, 1832.

[57] *Ibid.,* November 15, 22, 1832; Macon *Georgia Messenger,* November 15, 22, December 13, 1832.

Georgia to the principles of national supremacy on which were based Jackson's proclamation to the people of South Carolina and the Force bill, came out openly against the administration under the banner of state rights.[58] The Indian problem had been settled. No longer was there an imperative need for unanimity among Georgians in national affairs, and the natural division of the state into rich and poor, commercial and agrarian, became dominant in national as well as local politics. It was only a question of time until the State Rights party became the Whig party, and Berrien and other conservative, commercial men of Georgia found allies in men of similar interests in other sections of the country.

[58] Hunter to Biddle, November 18, 1832, Biddle MSS.; Macon *Georgia Messenger,* December 20, 1832; January 14, August 24, 30, 1833.

The Relations Between Judah P. Benjamin and Jefferson Davis:

SOME NEW LIGHT ON THE WORKING OF THE CONFEDERATE MACHINE

By ROBERT DOUTHAT MEADE

During the Civil War[1] it used to be said that Judah P. Benjamin and Mrs. Jefferson Davis "ran the machine at Richmond."[2] The statement has delicious implications. Even a professional Southerner should be amused at the thought of Benjamin, a Sephardic Jew born in the West Indies, and Varina Howell of the Yankee Howells[3] running the new government set up by the proud Southern gentry.

Like many such gossipy sayings, this one is only partly true. The actual extent of Mrs. Davis's power is left to be determined by a historian with sufficient experience in the methods by which some of the so-called weaker sex influence their life partners. The field which we propose to enter in the present study is more tangible, more subject to the ordinary rules of historical evidence. It is the relationship between Benjamin and Davis and its connection with the result of the Civil War. This subject the writer will treat in some detail, emphasizing aspects not generally familiar to the war historians.

It is hardly necessary to point out how much we still have to learn about the little inner circle of men who ran the Confederate machine.

[1] This paper was read at a joint session of the American Historical Association and the Southern Historical Association in Chicago, December 30, 1938, and has subsequently been slightly revised.

[2] John W. Burgess, *Reminiscences of an American Scholar* (New York, 1934), 291.

[3] Mrs. Davis's father was William Burr Howell, son of Richard Howell, Revolutionary governor of New Jersey. W. L. Whittlesey, "Richard Howell," in *Dictionary of American Biography,* 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), IX, 304.

Some excellent writing has been done on this subject, particularly in recent years. But the glamour of the gory side of war still lures many scholars into the study of insignificant skirmishes and minor brigadiers. The result is that to some of them such key men in the Richmond administration as George Wythe Randolph, James A. Seddon, and Lucius B. Northrop are little more than names. They know that these two Secretaries of War and the Commissary General held positions of vital importance to the Confederacy but are unable to give adequate appraisements of their work.

In the case of Judah P. Benjamin there is a similar lack of basic information. The Civil War historians have presented ample evidence that the bland, smiling little lawyer from cosmopolitan New Orleans had more influence with Jefferson Davis than any other Confederate. But important questions which remain are: In what fields was Benjamin's influence most significant? What was its nature and extent? By answering these queries we can explain many obscure yet momentous phases of Confederate history.

To begin with, it should be confessed that we are faced with a difficult task. We have not only to trace the footsteps of an important historical figure who worked "as few men have before or since" but to explain a subtle and often highly complex character. We can easily prove that Benjamin was the only genius in the Confederate cabinet. We can demonstrate that his career, with its American and English phases, was more glamorous than that of any other prominent Confederate. But we are still confronted with one perplexing problem: Judah P. Benjamin was an enigmatic figure—the most incomprehensible of all the Confederate leaders. Lee, Jackson, even Jefferson Davis, are crystal clear in comparison with the Jewish lawyer and statesman. The acrimonious dispute about his character began before the Civil War and has not ceased to this day.

Born at St. Croix[4] of Spanish Jewish parents, Judah Philip Benjamin spent his early youth in the Carolinas, attended Yale, and at the age of

[4] Data in birth certificate sent to the writer by Moses Sasso, Reader of the Hebrew Congregation at Saint Thomas. Benjamin's birthplace is sometimes erroneously given as Saint Thomas instead of Saint Croix.

seventeen went to New Orleans to seek his fortune. In the great entrepôt of the Mississippi Valley he rose to be one of the leading lawyers at an able bar, a state legislator, and member of two state constitutional conventions. Elected to the United States Senate and performing with distinction the duties of his office, he still found time to placate local spoilsmen, to help promote a railroad on the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, to represent in Ecuador the purported owner of guano interests in the Galapagos Islands, to make almost annual trips abroad, and to argue more cases before the United States Supreme Court than almost any other American lawyer. In short, Benjamin was not a Southerner of the provincial type but the sophisticated and none too squeamish representative of the new capitalism in the booming Louisiana port. Although conservative in matters of property rights, he was in some respects quite progressive. Above all, he was not the man "to die of an abstraction," as Henry A. Wise had feared would be the fate of Old Virginia.

Such was the bizarre figure whom Davis selected as attorney general of the new Confederacy. Since Benjamin had been a prominent member of the Southern party in the Senate, it might be assumed that the appointment to the cabinet had followed a prewar intimacy. But this was not the case. Benjamin and Davis had had little social intercourse before 1861 and had once been on the verge of a duel.[5] Nor was the appointment made because of any pronounced predilection on Benjamin's part for secession and the formation of a new government. During the months preceding the withdrawal of South Carolina from the Union he was absorbed in a lucrative mining case. This required his presence in California, and he did not sail for the East coast until four days after Lincoln's election.[6] He entered into secession reluctantly and, it seems, largely from reasons of expediency. In a confidential conversation on January 21, 1861, he is reported to have stated that the ablest of the secession leaders "really regard the experiment of a new Confederation as an effectual means of bringing the conservative masses of the North-

[5] Mrs. Jefferson Davis to Francis Lawley, April 4, 1897, and other data in Lawley MSS. Courtesy of the owner, Pierce Butler of New Orleans, Louisiana.

[6] He left San Francisco on the *Sonora,* bound for Panama, November 10, 1860. California dispatch to the New York *Times,* November 28, 1860.

ern people to realize the necessity of revising radically the instrument of union."[7]

Jefferson Davis must have had some inkling of Benjamin's real feeling about secession. He knew that the former Louisiana Senator was reluctant to accept the cabinet position. But this did not prevent him from securing Benjamin's services. Davis later stated that he selected Benjamin because of his "very high reputation" as a lawyer and the impression formed in the Senate of his ability and habits of industry.[8] Doubtless he was also influenced by the desire to have a Louisianan in the cabinet.

The appointment was a mistake. As H. J. Eckenrode has pointed out, Davis should have sent Benjamin abroad with enough money to win over the European chancelleries.[9] The attorney-generalship was too insignificant a position for Benjamin. His official duties were chiefly of a routine nature, and could have little effect on the results of the war. At a cabinet meeting in Montgomery, however, he did suggest that the Confederate government buy a large quantity of cotton, at least a hundred thousand bales, and ship it to England where the proceeds could be used to purchase munitions and to supply credit. But the cabinet laughed at Benjamin's fear of a serious war, and Davis did not attempt to carry out his plan.[10]

After this rebuff we have no evidence that Benjamin made any further proposals while attorney general which might have changed the course of the war. But the period of his tenure in this office was a fruitful time during which he studied Davis's character and ingratiated himself with him. High-minded as Davis was in most respects, we know that he was thin-skinned and at times even suspicious in his relations with others. On occasions he could be quite obstinate. No man could hold a position in

[7] *North American Review* (Boston, New York, 1815-), CXXIX (1879), 134.

[8] "Mr. Benjamin, of Louisiana, had a very high reputation as a lawyer, and my acquaintance with him in the Senate had impressed me with the lucidity of his intellect, his systematic habits and capacity for labor. He was therefore invited to the post of Attorney-General." Jefferson Davis, *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government,* 2 vols. (New York, 1881), I, 242.

[9] Conversation with the writer.

[10] Pierce Butler, *Judah P. Benjamin* (Philadelphia, 1906), 233-34.

the cabinet without submitting to the dominance of the President, as the able George Wythe Randolph was to learn to his sorrow.[11] This quality in Davis's character Benjamin seems to have quickly perceived. He decided to offer suggestions when he felt he could do so without causing undue offense, but he would not lay his head on the block. If Davis required him to pursue a policy which was against his best judgment, he would do so loyally and efficiently and hope for the best. At the same time he would seek means to increase his influence with the President. Robert Barnwell Rhett, a hostile critic, later wrote of Benjamin, "A man of great fertility of mind and resource, and of facile character, he was the factotum of the President, performed his bidding in various ways, and gave him the benefit of his brains in furtherance of the views of Mr. Davis."[12] There is much truth in Rhett's statement but it does not tell the entire story. Benjamin was the chief factotum of the President. He never dominated Davis. But by adapting himself to Davis's character and making himself extremely useful he did before the end of 1861 succeed in becoming the President's most influential adviser.

On September 17, 1861, Benjamin was appointed secretary of war.[13] This was then the most important position in the cabinet. During the next six months he devoted all his great talents to securing enough men, ammunition, and supplies to prepare for the expected Northern offensive. Working long hours, even apparently on Sundays and holidays,[14] he put his department on an efficient basis from which all his successors benefited. Jefferson Davis directed all the military affairs even to the extent of approving minor appointments. But Benjamin removed from Davis's shoulders an immense load of detail, and, ever loyal and uncomplaining, was a bulwark of strength in the President's mounting

[11] Information from Randolph's grandnephew, General Jefferson Randolph Kean of Washington, D. C. See, also, Robert D. Meade, "George Wythe Randolph," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, XV, 358-59.

[12] Robert U. Johnson and Clarence C. Buel (eds.), *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, 4 vols. (New York, 1887-1888), I, 105.

[13] He was acting secretary of war until November 12, 1861, and the regular incumbent until March 18, 1862.

[14] In one of his letters while secretary of war, Benjamin specifically stated that he was writing on Sunday. There is also other evidence indicating that he did an enormous amount of labor beyond normal working hours.

difficulties. He saw clearly the problems of the South as a whole and made a strenuous effort to prevent dispersion of men and materials to nonessential places.

The historians have generally agreed, however, that Benjamin proved a failure as war minister. Their verdict is just. He lacked sufficient tact and knowledge of military procedure to deal with sensitive generals, and he could not handle phases of his work requiring detailed military knowledge. But we do not appreciate how much he was blamed for actions taken at Davis's request, or how often he was really fighting the President's battles. For example, Benjamin was severely censured for the quarrel that nearly precipitated the resignation of "Stonewall" Jackson. But tucked away in one of Benjamin's letters in the *Official Records* is a statement that "at the President's instance" he had issued the order which so infuriated Jackson.[15] During his bitter quarrels with Joseph E. Johnston, P. G. T. Beauregard, and Henry A. Wise, Benjamin was really taking up the gage for Davis.

By March, 1862, there was a strong popular demand for Benjamin's removal. General Johnston, who then commanded the main Confederate army in the East, stated at a dinner party in Richmond attended by several high officials, that the Confederacy could not succeed while Benjamin remained secretary of war.[16] His conduct of the Roanoke Island affair was investigated by a hostile committee of the Confederate Congress. But Davis made him secretary of state in the very teeth of the criticism. To quote from a letter written by Mrs. Davis many years later, "The President promoted him with a personal and aggrieved sense of the injustice done to the man who had become his friend and right hand."[17]

When Benjamin assumed the duties of secretary of state in March, 1862, the rapprochement was complete. Davis and Benjamin were now working hand in glove, and the harassed President relied on the Secre-

[15] *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies,* 129 vols. (Washington, 1880-1901), Ser. I, Vol. V, 1059.

[16] Henry S. Foote, *War of the Rebellion; or, Scylla and Charybdis* (New York, 1866), 356-57.

[17] Lawley MSS.

tary of State as he did on no other man. In the absence of revealing data from Davis, another quotation is made from the account written by his wife:

> Mr. Benjamin was always ready for work, sometimes with half an hour's recess he remained with the Executive from ten in the morning until nine at night and together they traversed all the difficulties which encompassed our beleaguered land. . . . Both the President and the Secretary worked like galley slaves, early and late, Mr. Davis came home fasting, a mere mass of throbbing nerves, and perfectly exhausted; but Mr. Benjamin was always fresh and buoyant. One day I asked him what kept him up and he said, "I always carry to these long cabinet meetings a small cake which I eat when I begin to feel fatigued and it freshens me up at once." There was one striking peculiarity about his temperament. No matter what disaster befel[l] our arms after he had done all in his power to prevent or rectify it, he was never depressed. No reverse tortured him exceedingly, as it did Mr. Davis, who though he was too reticent and self-controlled to betray his anguish suffered like one in torment. Mr. Benjamin was serenely cheerful, played games, jested and talked as wittily as usual. His demeanour puzzled us so much that at last I asked him what comfort came to him? Was he hopeful of a fortunate termination? He said he believed there was a fate in the destiny of nations, and it was wrong and useless to distress one's self and thus weaken one's energy to bear what was foreordained to happen.[18]

The testimony of L. Q. Washington, the assistant secretary of state, and of numerous others substantiates this evidence of the intimate relationship between Benjamin and Davis. To this day the historians have never been able to determine to what extent each man was responsible for the Confederate policies. In attempting to do so, the writer realizes that he is entering upon treacherous ground. He does feel, however, that it is possible to reach certain definite conclusions.

We can safely assume that Benjamin did not exert a very salutary influence in military affairs. He had learned much while secretary of war. But, as is sometimes the case with men who have unusually quick minds, he overestimated the depth of the knowledge he had acquired. We have an excellent illustration of this weakness in a letter he wrote to Davis after the war. Referring to the removal of General Joseph E. Johnston from the command of the army in front of Atlanta, Benjamin stated that he "was most anxious for his removal at a much earlier

[18] *Ibid.*

date."[19] Benjamin seems to have retained the layman's conception of military strategy.

Benjamin also failed to bring Davis needed political strength among the Southern people. A politician who talked to Benjamin in 1861 spoke of him as having "a distinctly French turn of thought." However much Benjamin may have been at home in New Orleans, he did not speak the language of the average Southerner. Many did not understand him and some actively disliked him. The descendant of a Confederate general says that the name of Benjamin is still "anathema" in his family. Undoubtedly, Benjamin increased the feeling of separation between the Davis administration and the masses of the people.

But if Benjamin was not omnipotent and omniscient as his apologists would have us believe, he was the one man in the administration most likely to make the break with the past that was needed to win the war. Years before, in Louisiana, he had learned to appreciate the political axiom that half a loaf is better than no bread. Even before he left the war office he told Reuben Davis that he was willing to have peace under the condition that each party keep the territory then under its control. The North could have all the territory in Tennessee north of the Memphis and Charleston Railroad. Reuben Davis was astounded and told Banjamin that if the South could hope for no better result he would rather go back into the Union without further bloodshed.[20]

In his diplomatic relations with England and France Benjamin gave further proof of his coolly practical viewpoint toward Confederate problems. For this phase of his work he was almost ideally equipped by training and temperament, and Davis usually gave him a free hand, at least within certain limits. Unfortunately, Benjamin was seriously handicapped by the difficulties of communication with Europe. But it seems safe to attribute to his fine hand rather than to Davis the tempting proposal made to Louis Napoleon in the early part of 1862. Benjamin offered the Emperor one hundred thousand or more bales of cotton and the right to introduce French products into the South "for a certain de-

[19] Judah P. Benjamin to Jefferson Davis, February 15, 1879, in Dunbar Rowland (ed.), *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist,* 10 vols. (Jackson, Miss., 1923), VIII, 355-56.

[20] Reuben Davis, *Recollections of Mississippi and Mississippians* (Boston, 1891), 431-32.

fined period" if he would recognize the Confederacy or break the blockade.[21] After receiving this offer Napoleon made a determined effort to aid the South but could not secure British co-operation.

After Lincoln had issued his Emancipation Proclamation, it became clear that the South could not secure British recognition without "dishing" slavery. We know that near the end of the war Benjamin used his great influence to secure Davis's support for the proposal to arm the slaves and let them fight for their freedom. Furthermore, Benjamin's friend and messmate in Richmond, Duncan Kenner of Louisiana, was sent to Europe to offer emancipation in return for British recognition. These desperate proposals came too late. But a study of Benjamin's character and of his attitude toward the Negro problem leads one to believe that he would have favored emancipation a year or more earlier if he had felt Davis and the Southern people were ready for the measure.[22]

There is ample evidence to prove that Benjamin was a very strong if not controlling force in the relations between the Richmond government and the Confederate agents in Canada and the North. He was also Davis's right-hand man in his negotiations with the two Northern emissaries, John R. Gilmore and James Jaquess, and in preparing the instructions for the Hampton Roads commissioners. It is worthy of mention that Benjamin is reported to have urged Davis to place Gilmore and Jaquess in Castle Thunder until after the Northern election, so that they could not influence the voters.

During the last desperate months of the war Benjamin hinted at the need for a dictatorship if the South could win by no other means. But we may presume that he wanted Davis, not Lee, to be the dictator. In February, 1865, Benjamin made a stirring speech in Richmond during which he publicly advocated arming of the slaves and stated that he would never surrender as long as a drop of blood flowed in his veins. During this final period he was bitterly attacked. On February 21 he

[21] Benjamin to John Slidell, April 12, 1862, in *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion,* 30 vols. (Washington, 1894-1919), Ser. II, Vol. III, 387.

[22] References to source material which are not supplied in this study will be given in a biography of Benjamin which the writer is now completing.

wrote a letter to Davis offering to resign if this action would rid him of embarrassment. To the best of the writer's knowledge this letter has never been published, and its text is inserted to show certain truly noble qualities in the man:

Confidential

Department of State
Richmond 21 February 1865

My dear Sir

I have been recently disturbed in mind on a subject which I can no longer refrain from placing frankly before you—

It is unnecessary to remind you that I accepted office with reluctance and have retained it solely from a sense of duty—Separated from my family for nearly five years past, my eager desire to see them has been repressed by the belief that my services were not without value to you: and I knew how impossible it was for any human being to sustain the burthen now weighing on you, without zealous and cordial aid—

For some months past however I have doubted whether my withdrawal from office would not rather promote the success of your administration than deprive you of useful assistance—It has been apparent that I have been the object of concerted and incessant assault by those who are inimical to me personally, as well as by all in Congress and the press that are hostile to you—These attacks have been regarded by me with entire indifference, except as suggesting the doubt above expressed—If our affairs were in a more prosperous condition, I should tender my resignation unconditionally, confident that if found desirable it would be in my power to return to your assistance in the Legislative Department of the Government—But in the present juncture I shrink from giving Color for an instant to the suspicion of a desire to shield myself from danger or responsibility by abandonment of duty—

I must therefore beg you to let me know your own conclusion with entire unreserve—Will your administration be strengthened or any opposition to it disarmed by substituting another in my place in the Cabinet?

If so, I will at once seek the sphere of duty above referred to, in which I know I can be serviceable in sustaining you in this great struggle—If not, I shall cheerfully continue the sacrifice of private inclination and family affection to the call of duty, at all hazards, and under all responsibilities—

I am with entire regard and respect

Your friend & obt st

J. P. BENJAMIN

To the President

Benjamin accompanied Davis in his flight southward after the fall of Richmond. At a cabinet meeting in Greensboro he was the only member who supported Davis in his determination to continue the war but he soon realized the futility of further resistance. After he had

escaped to London he continued his cordial relations with the former President. In a letter to the London *Times* he paid a high tribute to Davis's character. Later, he wrote Davis that although he would defend him against aspersions on his character he would not become involved in controversies regarding the Confederacy. That stormy period of his life was a closed chapter. "I freely confess that it is not agreeable to mix in any way in controversies of the past which for me are buried forever."[23] It was such sentiments that led some of Benjamin's enemies to accuse him of lack of deep feeling. But Jefferson Davis trusted him utterly. He wrote to the London *Times* some years after the war that he had learned to know Benjamin better perhaps than any other living man and added, "neither in private conversation nor in Cabinet council have I heard him utter one unworthy thought, one ungenerous sentiment." Davis told a Confederate veteran with whom the writer talked that he considered Benjamin the ablest member of his cabinet; that his career in England after the war justified his estimate of him.

Although the only genius in the Confederate cabinet, Benjamin was not infallible. Evidence which has been secured from a large mass of unpublished material as well as from the obvious sources proves that there were several dubious episodes in his career. He was given to quixotic enthusiasms and was sometimes too cocksure of his knowledge. But Benjamin was possessed of keen intellect, high courage, and rare qualities of devotion and self-sacrifice. He had a cosmopolitan background and wide practical experience, and viewed Confederate problems with a cool detachment. He knew from the beginning that the South was faced with a serious war, and was willing to take the radical steps necessary to obtain victory over heavy obstacles. He broke away from the theory of King Cotton and was even willing to "dish" slavery when he felt the war could be won by no other means. He was a bulwark of strength for the Confederate President, and during the last three years of the war was his most influential adviser. Davis was strong-minded to the last, and never gave him a free hand. But making the best of the opportunities that he had, Benjamin proved himself one of the coolest and most dangerous revolutionists whom the North had to face.

[23] Rowland (ed.), *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist,* VIII, 356.

The Indian Frontier in South Carolina as Seen by the S. P. G. Missionary

By FRANK J. KLINGBERG

The anthropologist and the ethnologist, latecomers in the study of native peoples, owe much to the missionary, who was often the sole pioneer observer. Darwin acknowledged this debt again and again in his observations during his five-year voyage in the *Beagle*. The missionary, although intent upon his own definite objectives, carried with him not only ideas of farming and of medicine, for example, but inevitably was the representative of European civilization in its many aspects. He naturally included in his reports much of value to later natural and social scientists,[1] however loud their complaints at times may be that the churchman altered pure laboratory material by his virile intervention with new ideas and ideals. Gathering invaluable bodies of information and carrying out their missionary and educational programs, the two venerable Anglican societies, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, have built up traditions of dealing with primitive peoples and cultures. The modern missionary in his tremendous task of building a new ideology upon old fabrics no longer speaks of aboriginal customs as "superstitions" or devil's tales, but is more content to infiltrate the essentials of Christianity and Western culture into the vast varieties of non-European civilizations. The present missionary aim is to " 'absorb all that is best in western culture into a culture evolved from all that is best in African life,' "[2] or other native civilization.

[1] A discussion of the missionary as an explorer may be found in Heinrich Vedder, *South West Africa in Early Times*, trans. and ed. by Cyril G. Hall (London, 1938), 183.

[2] Denys W. T. Shropshire, *The Church and Primitive Peoples* (London, 1938), quoted in the London *Times, Literary Supplement*, September 3, 1938, p. 564.

The training of native leaders, a chief aim in modern times, was an objective early visualized in the work of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in South Carolina. It has not always been easily seen that even the native teacher must be encouraged to appreciate the traditional values of his own society. It is therefore remarkable to find a man of the genius and vision of the Frenchman, Dr. Francis Le Jau, who found the Indians with qualities that shamed him as a Christian. Many of his observations made during his work in South Carolina would be "advanced" for the present day and suggest that intelligence is timeless and that a man may appear well ahead of his age. He and his fellow workers, at times naïve, dogmatic, narrow, or inspired, recorded the contemporary scene of early South Carolina and gave eyewitness reports of frontier conditions.

According to the missionaries' letters of the period, beginning about 1702, the Creek, Cherokee, and Yamassee were the most numerous of the Indian tribes of South Carolina, although the Savannah, Ittiwan, Apalachi, Chickasaw, and others were represented.[3] The majority of the Indians, except those who were slaves, were far removed from the English settlements, and could be reached only by difficult journeys over treacherous trails. The language difficulty was another barrier which the missionaries struggled to remove. The trader's commercial vocabulary was inadequate for the purposes of religious teaching and even this limited knowledge he could not, or perhaps would not, transmit to the missionaries. Dr. Le Jau, writing in 1711, complained of the trader's resistance to appeals: "I will take great pains to get those several dialects. . . . I only complain of the dullness and laziness of those traders that could inform me. There is no scholar and hardly a man of sense among them all."[4]

[3] No attempt has been made to compare the information of the missionary of this period with the scientific knowledge of Indian life and customs as now known, or with other sources, contemporary or later.

[4] Francis Le Jau to John Chamberlayne, Goose Creek, South Carolina, July 14, 1711, in Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts Manuscripts (Library of Congress Transcripts), A6, No. 104. Cited hereafter as S. P. G. MSS. For a survey of Le Jau's work in South Carolina, see Edgar L. Pennington, "The Reverend Francis Le Jau's Work among Indians and Negro Slaves," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), I (1935), 442-58.

Dr. Le Jau, soon after his arrival in South Carolina, became interested in communication with and in the instruction of the Indians. In December, 1706, he wrote to the Society:

> They [the Indians] speak divers languages in their several nations, but I am . . . informed . . . that there is a language called the Savannas which is fine, smooth, and easy to be got . . . there is an Indian town an 100 miles of S. Carolina . . . where . . . that language may be learned. I propose that some young men not yet in holy orders, though with a tincture of good learning, should be encouraged to come upon that account and humbly submit my judgement to that of the Society.[5]

In September, 1708, the missionary sent a copy of the Lord's Prayer in the Savannah language to the S. P. G.[6] The two Indian languages in most general use were the Yamassee and the Savonock, but these were unrelated languages. Each nation had not only a peculiar dialect but also a different language, "and yet the two languages of the north and south called Crick and Saoöck are understood by the respective inhabitants the most part and most sensible of them."[7]

The early letters report conversations with the Indians and especially note fragmentary references to biblical stories and teachings. Referring to the Indian conception of immortality, the Rev. Francis Varnod declared that all of the tribes had some notion of a life after death; they believed that "the wicked go in a cold country being very lean and naked . . . and that the good go in a very warm country where nothing is wanting to make them happy."[8] The Rev. Robert Maule of St. John's had

[5] Le Jau to Chamberlayne, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, December 2, 1706, in S. P. G. MSS., A3, No. 68. Le Jau secured this information from a certain Pike, an Indian trader. He called Savannas "The transcendent language of America."

[6] *Id.* to [Secretary], St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, September 15, 1708, *ibid.*, A4, No. 125. Le Jau stated in a letter of February [19], 1710, that the language should be called Saonoh, "from the chief town inhabited by a colony that transplanted themselves from Albany to the place where the *Westos* lived Northwest of us." *Ibid.*, A5, No. 82.

[7] Le Jau to Chamberlayne, Goose Creek, South Carolina, February 9, 1711, *ibid.*, A6, No. 58.

[8] Francis Varnod to the Society, South Carolina, April 1, 1724, *ibid.*, B4, No. 173. An Indian burial ceremony is also described in this letter. See Herbert E. Bolton, "The Mission as a Frontier Institution in the Spanish-American Colonies," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXIII (1917), 42-61, for Roman Catholic work carried on across the continent from Florida to California. It is a reasonable assumption that Christian ideas could have permeated northward much beyond the immediate Spanish Florida frontier. Over one thousand Apalachi were sold into slavery in Carolina after a Spanish Franciscan

discovered in some of his conversation with the Indians, "their belief of a God and of future rewards and punishments. When I have asked, who it was that made them, and who it is who still provides for them they have pointed upwards with their finger and told me it was God."[9]

Dr. Le Jau was also convinced that the Indians had absorbed Christian ideas, through his observations of the Indians living near Goose Creek.[10] Every year they had a dance which lasted for three days, during which time the men danced by themselves in the daylight hours; the women for that period never came near the men, but at night the women would dance by themselves. Le Jau asked the reason of that separation, and one of the men answered: "'twas to remember a time wherein Man was made alone and there was no woman; but, after God took somewhat out of man and made woman. Asking what it was God took, the man put his hand upon his breast . . . and then called it a bone. My wife presently named a rib, the Indian smiled and said Yes."[11]

Another tribe, the Ittiwan, had a practice of taking annually the largest deer they could capture in a hunt on a particular day and of hanging it upon a long post to the Lord for Him to consume. Another Ittiwan custom was the annointment of a dead man with either bear or hickory oil by the women.[12] One Ittiwan Indian festival was carefully described by Dr. Le Jau in 1711. About forty Indians, painted and dressed in their finery and led by three young men, gave a ceremonial dance. Le Jau questioned an elderly Indian, a Captain George, about this ceremony, who replied that the three young men and those that followed were the sons of one man from whom the rest came, and the little hut where they stopped was a ship. Dr. Le Jau reflected:

This made me suspect they had some tradition about Noah's Ark and his three sons. I asked another Indian at my house about the ceremony, who told me of a ship that had white men which were brought to his country, and as he wanted

mission established in northwest Florida between 1702 and 1708 was burnt and the priests killed, following a defeat at the hands of the English.

[9] Robert Maule to Chamberlayne, [St. John's], South Carolina, August 2, 1711, in S. P. G. MSS., A7, pp. 363-64.

[10] These were probably of the Yamassee tribe, although no tribe is mentioned.

[11] Le Jau to Chamberlayne, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, February 1, 1709/1710, in S. P. G. MSS., A5, No. 98.

[12] *Id.* to *id., ibid.*

words to express his meaning I told him the best I could of the Ark of Noah. . . . He answered, "They said so in his country."[13]

The reports agree in the description of the Indian character as just and equitable in business dealings. Pride in his word did not permit an Indian chief to cheat or to bear being cheated. The heads of the families had great respect paid to them by their children, who were usually numerous. According to Varnod, who described their tribal practices in the words of the church, they permitted fornication but condemned adultery, for which some tribes punished their guilty women by cutting of their hair as a mark of infamy. Some tribes practiced circumcision. Variety of customs and differences in degrees of intelligence were impressed upon Le Jau who believed that the

Savannoh Indians are but dull and mean to what the Florida Indians are whom we call amongst us Crick Indians. These last are honest, polite, and have noble and virtuous principles. The Crick Indians language is understood by many nations namely the Yamoussee, and I am still confirmed that the Savanock language is understood as far as Canada.[14]

The missionaries, as well as other residents of South Carolina, felt alarm over the French settlements on the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. In 1708 the Rev. Robert Stevens advised the Secretary of the Society that it would be good policy for the Queen, in the impending treaty of peace, to oblige the French to leave their settlements "on all the Rivers, Bays, Harbours and Inlets on the Bay of Mexico," or else the French would draw the Indians to them by presents and force "so there will be no need of sending Missionaries to convert them."[15]

The greatest obstacle, however, in the way of Christianization was the conduct of the whites. In 1708 Commissary Gideon Johnston wrote to the Society:

The people here, generally speaking, are the vilest race of men upon the Earth, they have neither honour, nor honesty, nor Religion enough to entitle them to any tolerable character, being a perfect Medl[e]y or Hotch potch made up of Bankrupts, Pirates, decayed Libertines, Sectaries, and Enthusiasts of all sorts

[13] *Id.* to [*id.*], St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, January 4, 1711/1712, *ibid.*, A7, p. 393.

[14] *Id.* to *id.*, Goose Creek, South Carolina, February 9, 1711, *ibid.*, A6, No. 58.

[15] Robert Stevens to *id.*, Goose Creek, South Carolina, February 3, 1708, *ibid.*, A4, No. 19.

who have transported themselves hither from the Bermudas, Jamaica, Barbadoes, Montserat, Antego, Nevis, New England, Pennsylvania, etc., and are the most factious and seditious people in the whole world.[16]

From the testimony of the Indian traders, Johnston formed the opinion that it was no hard matter to convert the Indians, but he knew "nothing that would obstruct it more; than the scandalous lives of those very traders who are a wretched sort of men."[17]

Indeed, beginning with the age of discovery, the missionary, together with the man of humanitarian instincts, has spoken of the white man's ruthlessness and evil effects upon the native in terms not different from those used by Commissary Johnston. Las Casas in the West Indies, Camoens in India, the Jesuits in Paraguay, and British missionaries in Africa have attempted to protect the native from absorption of the low points of European culture. In Paraguay an attempt was made, as is well known, to shut out the white man entirely, but, in the long run, his evil influences seeped in as did diseases of the body.[18] Stevens held the opinion that the English, by their conduct on the frontier, shocked the Indians so that it was difficult to persuade them to embrace Christianity.[19] Several of the Indian chiefs called at Stevens' home on their way to the Governor to complain that twenty families of them who had submitted to the English government were enslaved by two Indian traders. A distinguished American scholar has expressed the opinion in oral discussion that the North American Indian could not have been saved and that all the stupendous efforts made by missionaries, humanitarians, and governmental officials availed nothing. The impact of the whites, in their wide-fronted folk migration, swept the Indian westward and disintegrated his civilization. The inadequate internal cohesion of the Indian tribe and something in the nobility of his nature made it easy for the white man to bore within for commercial purposes with destructive results.

Dr. Le Jau, while admitting that the Indian's psychology and methods

[16] Gideon Johnston to *id.*, September 20, 1708, *ibid.*, No. 97.

[17] *Id.* to *id.*, Charlestown, South Carolina, July 5, 1710, *ibid.*, A5, No. 158.

[18] For a short account of the Jesuits in Paraguay, see E. J. Payne, *History of European Colonies* (London, 1889), 94-97.

[19] Stevens to Chamberlayne, Goose Creek, South Carolina, February 3, 1708, in S. P. G. MSS., A4, No. 19.

of warfare made him peculiarly self-destructive in his civil wars, lamented, "Is it not to be feared some white men living or trading among them do foment and increase that Bloody Inclination in order to get Slaves?"[20] In 1709 the missionary decided that,

> if anything opposes the publishing of the Gospel among the Indians it shall be the manner how our Indian trade is carried on, chiefly the fomenting of war among them for our people to get slaves. . . . interest has a great power here and does occasion injustice too visibly to my great sorrow, and through misfortune I see no remedy but to be patient and pray and labour as much as I am able. . . .[21]

Daily complaints were received by Le Jau of the cruelty and injustice of the Indian traders. He related how, in 1710, a trader caused one of his female Indian slaves to be scalped within two miles of his house, and he wished it could be to the credit of the Society to prevent such enormities.[22] Maule was creditably informed of the lewd and debauched practices of the traders, some of whom were "guilty of such gross enormities, as even the more modest heathens themselves have been ashamed of."[23] When Maule would ask the Indians if they desired to join the white man's religion, they usually said no. " 'What is the matter,' said I, 'why so?' 'Because,' replied they, 'Backarara [whites] drunk grandy; me no lovy that.' "[24]

In regard to the trader, David Livingstone felt that commerce could be a civilizing force and so stated before commercial gatherings on his various trips to England. He believed that, if the representative groups of a whole business community could be moved in, the evils of the pioneering fringe could be avoided. Various experiments made to keep the trader out entirely had merely resulted in keeping the desirable trader out. The native also, as sometimes happened, in a period of reversion to

[20] Le Jau to Secretary, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, April 22, 1708, *ibid.*, No. 64.

[21] *Id.* to Chamberlayne, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, October 20, 1709, *ibid.*, A5, No. 49.

[22] *Id.* to *id.*, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, June 13, 1710, *ibid.*, No. 120.

[23] Maule to *id.*, n. d. [1710], *ibid.*, No. 133. Maule stated in this letter that his work had been mostly with the whites, because he believed that if they could be persuaded to lead Christian lives, it would facilitate the conversion of both Negroes and Indians.

[24] *Id.* to *id.*, [St. John's], South Carolina, August 2, 1711, *ibid.*, A7, p. 365.

his older customs proved himself unmanageable by the relatively lone missionary.

The first missionary to South Carolina, the Rev. Samuel Thomas, was sent for the express purpose of converting the Yamassee Indians, but on arriving at Goose Creek he decided that the Negroes were in great need of Christianity, so he asked the Society to excuse "his going among the Indians and praying the Society to continue him in the place where he is now."[25] Again and again, the missionary of the S. P. G. was distracted by the richness of three fields: the semicivilized white inhabitants, the Negroes, who formed part of the white man's parish, and the Indians, who were on the move, interspersed by a few traders, and equally his charges. Whichever field he chose, heroic qualities were called for. Hostile planters watched his work among the slaves, and the Indian work had greater dangers of its own.

Thomas Nairne, agent for the Indians, was greatly perturbed over this action of Thomas. Nairne had written several letters to the S. P. G. discussing the arguments in favor of conversion of the Indians of South Carolina.[26] He said that Englishmen for the two past years had been "entirely kniving all the Indian towns in Florida which were subject to the Spaniards." By this means 1,600 Indians, mostly of the Yamassee tribe, had been brought to the colony. These Indians maintained their fidelity and friendship to the Spaniards and their friends until downright force brought them to the English side. If the English did not take care of their salvation equal to that of the Spaniards, it would be like bringing people from Christianity to barbarity and heathenism.

> Everybody knows we have the greatest quantity of Indians subject to this government of any in all America . . . with whom here hath never been any wrangle . . . from the first settlement of this province until this time who are so

[25] Rev. Mr. Samuel Thomas to [Secretary], South Carolina, January 29, 1702, in Journal of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (Library of Congress Transcripts), I, June 18, 1703. Cited hereafter as Journal S. P. G. Stevens of Goose Creek said in 1705 that Thomas preached to a congregation already supplied with a minister, a Rev. Kendal. Thomas drew the congregation away from Kendal, who was left without a means of livelihood. See Stevens to the Society, n. d. [November, 1705?], Goose Creek, South Carolina, in S. P. G. MSS., A2, No. 156.

[26] Thomas Nairne to Rev. Edward Marston, St. Helena, South Carolina, August 20, 1705, inclosed in a letter of Stevens to the Society, Goose Creek, South Carolina, n. d. [November, 1705?], *ibid.*, No. 156.

very subject to the government that they are ready to obey any fellow who trades among them. All this makes it easier for us to undertake propagating the Christian faith among them, than it is for the northern colonies. Besides that, their language is enriched with abundance of Spanish words particularly those pertaining to religion, the want of which often troubles missionaries.[27]

Besides the spiritual benefits, Nairne stated it would conduce to the Indians' ease and satisfaction to have a good man live among them, apart from all the disputes of trade, who would, in fact, be a protector. He believed that it would be in vain for the Society to attempt any work without the concurrence of the government, and recommended that it have letters prepared from the Lords Proprietors and from one of the secretaries of state, in the Queen's name, to the Governor and Council of South Carolina. The letters should threaten the South Carolina government with royal displeasure if it failed to support the missionaries.

To meet the financial problems Nairne worked out an elaborate scheme for the maintenance of missionaries without any support from the Society. He proposed that the Queen settle £100 per annum out of her dues in the province; that the Lords Proprietors pay £80 per annum; and that an act be passed that every man who had traded with the Indians for three years should pay £4 yearly, and everyone else fifty shillings per annum during the initial three years, and then £4 for ever after. There were some fifty traders in South Carolina who would contribute at least £150 revenue,[28] and this added to the other would allow £330 for six missionaries, or £55 per annum for each one. He was convinced that

> Everyone will presently agree that it is reasonable the Indian traders should help towards converting and civilizing a people among whom they have got good estates, and to whom they have hitherto shown none of the best examples. These sparks make little of drinking 15 or 16 pounds in one bout in town, and they may spare so much from the punch keepers for this end, and they are no poorer at the years end.
>
> Sir, this is the most easy method . . . and if the Society will . . . use their interest . . . they may doubtless bring their friends to bear.[29]

[27] *Ibid.* See, also, Bolton, "The Mission as a Frontier Institution in the Spanish-American Colonies," in *loc. cit.*, 42-61.

[28] It appears that the amount to be paid yearly should be £3 instead of £4, as Nairne stated that the fifty men engaged in trading by paying £3 per year would raise £150, whereas if they paid the £4 as Nairne first stated the amount would be £200.

[29] Nairne to Marston, St. Helena, South Carolina, August 20, 1705, inclosed in a letter of

The missionaries sent by the Society, Nairne advised, should not be a nice, delicate sort of people, "but ones willing to bear hardships and live among uncivilized people, who had nothing of the fineness of the English people." Oftentimes, the town where the missionary would be stationed would have only two or three other white men. The S. P. G. was cautioned by Nairne to give the missionaries ample salaries, because the workers "must first apply themselves to learn their language and come with a pure design of increasing the Christian Church without any extraordinary hopes of riches or profit."[30]

The ideas and plans of Thomas Nairne are particularly interesting when compared with the contemporaneous and later efforts made by the S. P. G. to Christianize the Iroquois. Nairne anticipated some of the plans of Sir William Johnson expressed in language curiously similar. Nairne viewed the Spanish Franciscan missionary from Florida in much the same way that Johnson viewed Jesuit penetration from Canada. Each Indian agent pointed out that the Roman Catholic missionaries mobilized and lived among the Indians to such good effect that comparable plans for Indian conversion and education might be developed by the Anglicans.[31]

The first opinion that Dr. Le Jau formed of the Indians, when he arrived in Goose Creek in 1706, was that they were "very quiet, sweet humored, and patient, content with little which are great dispositions to be true Christians."[32] However, after he had lived in Goose Creek for six months, his good opinion grew even more favorable. The Indians with whom he had conversed made him "ashamed by their life, conversation, and sense of religion."[33] He found in the Indian as did other

Stevens to the Society, P. G., Goose Creek, South Carolina, n. d. [November, 1705?], in S. P. G. MSS., A2, No. 156.

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] Frank J. Klingberg, "Sir William Johnson and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (1749-1774)," in *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (Garrison, N. Y., 1932-), VIII (1939), 4-37; *id.*, "The Noble Savage as Seen by the S. P. G. Missionary in Colonial New York, 1702-1750," *ibid.*, 128-65.

[32] Le Jau to Chamberlayne, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, December 2, 1706, *ibid.*, A3, No. 68.

[33] *Id.* to Rev. Philip Stubbs, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, April 15, 1707, *ibid.*, A3, No. 141.

missionaries "nature's simple man," and he contributed in his own way to the development of "the cult of the noble savage." Whereas the Englishman's religion consisted chiefly of words and appearances, the Indians found theirs in reality; Dr. Le Jau expressed the hope that the savages would soon be worshipping Christ. The Indians had been oppressed, he said, by the traders, which made them surly. In 1708 he wrote to the Society:

> The Yamassee's have sent for a Clergyman to baptise their children. I would willingly go and do which I could among them, if I had strength of Body sufficient; God willing . . . I will [have] . . . the Servants Slaves and free Indians to come and be Catechised. I perceive I shall be contradicted but I will try, and send you an account of all.[34]

In April of the same year, 1708, the King of one of the Apalachi settlements honored Dr. Le Jau with a visit. Le Jau reported that he was a man of great power over his people and desired to have a minister reside among his tribe, most of whom had been baptized by their former rulers, the Spaniards.[35]

By the next year, Dr. Le Jau reported the welcome news that he had several Indian slaves under trial for baptism, but he received no encouragement from masters or parents. He said, "I cannot to this day prevail upon some to make a difference between Slaves and free Indians, and Beasts."[36]

Le Jau had formed the usual opinion that the free Indians were "a good sort of people" who would have been more civilized, if they had not been spoiled by bad examples. The Rev. Maule of St. John's was of the same opinion. The only plan for the conversion of the Indians that he could conceive of was to eliminate all the traders who did not lead a sober and virtuous life. "This I conceive would be an excellent means to hasten the conversion of these poor infidels, to make them in love with our religion and dispose them readily and heartily to embrace it."[37]

[34] *Id.* to Chamberlayne, Goose Creek, South Carolina, March 13, 1708, *ibid.*, A4, No. 18.

[35] *Id.* to Secretary, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, April 22, 1708, *ibid.*, No. 64.

[36] *Id.* to Chamberlayne, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, February 18, 1709, *ibid.*, No. 142; also in Journal S. P. G., I, October 21, 1709.

[37] Maule to *id.*, n. d. [1710], in S. P. G. MSS., A5, No. 133; also in Journal S. P. G., I, October 20, 1710.

The sense of justice among the Indians, moreover, was admirable but "As for their sense of God, their notion[s] are obscure indeed, but when we take pains to converse with them in a jargon . . . We perceive their souls are fit materials which may easily be polished. They agree with me about the duty of praying and doing the good and eschewing the evil."[38] Many of the Indians could not conceive of murder as evil. Dr. Le Jau quaintly stated that some of the Indians confided in him by saying "that evil spirit never excites them to anything more than hatred, revenge, and murder of those that offend them."[39]

The Indians around Goose Creek would go to see Dr. Le Jau whenever they happened to be living nearby,[40] but conversation was made difficult by lack of a common language, so he was constantly asking the Society to send a few young men among the Indians to learn the Savannah language, a tongue understood by all the Indian tribes. However, he noticed that the young Indians, born since the coming of the English, were tractable and spoke English quite clearly, even though their parents brought them up in wild fashion. The fathers and mothers declared they had forgotten most of their traditions since the establishment of the colony; they kept their festivals but could not give the reasons for them.[41] Furthermore, some of the Apalachi Indian slaves were uncertain that they should be baptized in their state of comparative ignorance of Christianity, and, therefore, Dr. Le Jau asked if he could "baptize them conditionally."[42]

All of the missionaries in the colony were handicapped by the scarcity of information concerning the Indians. The Yamassee were inclined to embrace the Christian faith, Commissary Johnston heard as early as 1711, and he wrote to John Chamberlayne that now that he had been

[38] Le Jau to *id.*, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, October 20, 1709, in S. P. G. MSS., A5, No. 49.

[39] *Ibid.*

[40] The Indians, of course, were constantly changing places in order to get food, having no provisions laid up.

[41] Most of the old men had died or had gone farther up into the country because of bad treatment by the people and injustice of the traders.

[42] Le Jau to [Secretary], South Carolina, February 10, 1709/1710, in Journal S. P. G., I, April 21, 1710; see, also, *ibid.*, II, May 18, 1711.

appointed a commissioner of the Indian Trade Act, he expected to obtain firsthand information concerning the spread of religion among all the Indians.[43] He also felt it his duty to give several Spanish New Testaments to the Spanish prisoners, held in Charleston. The Spaniards had no doubt but that the copies would be burned if they fell into Roman Catholic hands, and "that it would be a difficult matter for them to escape the same fate."[44] Commissary Johnston commented:

> Upon my delivering the books to them, I asked them, by an interpreter, what they thought of the doctrine of transubstantiation, to which they readily answered that they believed as the Protestants did and presently turned over to I Cor. II where they said that article was set in the clearest light. . . . I was greatly pleased. . . .[45]

In order to hasten the conversion of the Indians, fifty copies of the Spanish Testament were also sent to Dr. Le Jau to be dispersed among the Spaniards and Indians bordering on Carolina.[46] An indefatigable worker for the Society, in his spare hours he wrote his memoirs and a summary of the conversations he had concerning the Indians. The latter was based upon the information given to him by the more intelligent and honest traders.[47] This account of the Indians, chiefly of the Yamassee, he forwarded to the Society by Mrs. Gideon Johnston, in July, 1711.[48]

Dr. Le Jau's good opinions of the Yamassee grew rapidly:

> if two young single men having a disposition to learn the Creek language which is understood all over the southern parts of this settlement would trust themselves into the hands of the Yamasi . . . they would provide for them and entertain them with great respect and affection. Besides our own people live

[43] Johnston to Chamberlayne, [Charlestown, South Carolina], January 27, 1711, in S. P. G. MSS., A6, No. 64. Commissary Johnston said that poor health and insufficient funds were obstacles in the way of his gaining more information about the Indians.

[44] *Ibid.*

[45] *Ibid.* Johnston could not keep the Spaniards from kissing his hands as a gesture of thankfulness for the books.

[46] Journal S. P. G., I, June 16, 1710; II, May 18, 1711. Le Jau was also asked if it would be advantageous to give Spanish Testaments to the Spaniards and Indians of Florida or the West Indies.

[47] Le Jau to Chamberlayne, Goose Creek, South Carolina, February 9, 1711, in S. P. G. MSS., A6, No. 58; also in Journal S. P. G., II, May 18, 1711.

[48] *Id.* to *id.*, Goose Creek, South Carolina, July 10, 1711, in S. P. G. MSS., A6, No. 103.

within 20 or 15 miles of those Nations, who really by my own observation are a rational and generous people above the rest of our neighboring Indians.[49]

A remnant of the Apalachi tribe, moreover, was also desirous of having missionaries reside among them, according to Dr. Le Jau, but he was not informed as to what they could do for a clergyman if one were sent. When this information reached the Lord Bishop of London he wrote to the Secretary of the S. P. G., William Taylor, in January, 1713, requesting him to send two missionaries to the Yamassee and the Apalachi, who would receive them well. And the Lord Bishop added that he had received his information from Dr. Le Jau "whom the Society very well knows, and is acquainted with his Sincereity, and good understanding."[50]

By 1713 forewarnings of the disastrous Indian War were appearing. Dr. Le Jau at this very time gave an account of the Yamassee, in which he said that the "brown" men could formerly muster eight hundred warriors, but now they were so reduced by wars that they could not raise four hundred. All the other Indian allies were in the same predicament. Indian intertribal wars would likely continue, because the fur trade was not flourishing, and the Indians would sell one another to the French or Spaniards to pay for the goods the traders sold them.[51] Early in the eighteenth century the English settlements were penetrating away from the coast to the west and coming into contact with powerful tribes of which the Yamassee were most immediately on the line of march. A relatively small tribe, but extremely warlike, they were defeated in 1715 and largely dispersed, some returning to Florida to rejoin a remnant of the tribe still living there, and others were lost.

However, Dr. Le Jau never lost faith in the Indians, even though he reported that many of the clergy had been driven from their parishes[52] by the Indian uprisings. He maintained that the Indians were "very

[49] *Id.* to [William Taylor], St. James Parish, Goose Creek, South Carolina, August 30, 1712, *ibid.*, A7, pp. 436-37.

[50] Lord Bishop of London to *id.*, Fulham, London, January 18, 1712/1713, *ibid.*, p. 43. The Lord Bishop described the Yamassee as a "brave, generous, and civilized people."

[51] Le Jau to *id.*, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, August 10, 1713, *ibid.*, A8, p. 363; Journal S. P. G., II, June 1, 1714.

[52] *Id.* to [Secretary], South Carolina, August 23, [1715], in Journal S. P. G., III, March 6, 1715/1716.

British People" and if some minister would live among them and learn their language, it would in time do good to the youth.[53] Before the Indian attack upon the colonists interrupted the good relations it may be said that from the beginning of the Society's work in South Carolina, very few Indian baptisms had been made. One of the first baptisms of an Indian slave was recorded by Rev. Thomas Hasell of St. Thomas Parish in 1711.[54] In 1714 Rev. William Taylor of St. Andrew's reported that he had lately baptized twenty-six persons, Negroes and Indians,[55] and had one Indian boy of his own whom he intended to baptize before long.[56]

As stated above, the disastrous Indian War, which started on Good Friday, April 15, 1715, completely dispersed some Indian nations, and many of the white settlements were evacuated. It is interesting to note the causes of the war as explained by one of the Society's missionaries, the Rev. William Bull of Charleston.

> We . . . acknowledge that our manifold sins and wickedness have justly drawn this judgment from him. . . .
>
> The manner also of carrying on the trade among the Indians . . . the most profligate and debauched generally undertaking that business. . . .
>
> Another occasion . . . of the war . . . [is] the poverty of the Indians and the wealth of the English. . . .
>
> There's another reason. . . . They say that the Indians are so naturally addicted to war and bloodshed and so long accustomed to it that 'tis almost impossible for them to abstain from it.[57]

The Rev. Bull declared that the government had endeavored to persuade the several Indian tribes to be at peace with one another. Therefore, the Indians were much strengthened by being at peace among themselves, and resolved to try to cut off all the whites. The design of the Christians to promote peace was very laudable, Bull was persuaded,

[53] *Id.* to [*id.*], St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, March 19, 1715/1716, *ibid.*, February 1, 1716/1717.

[54] Thomas Hasell to Chamberlayne, St. Thomas Parish, South Carolina, September 4, 1711, in S. P. G. MSS., A6, No. 143; Journal S. P. G., II, December 21, 1711.

[55] The exact number of Indians baptized is not given. Taylor to [Secretary], St. Andrews Parish, South Carolina, December 31, 1714, in Journal S. P. G., III, October 7, 1715.

[56] This boy was under six years of age, yet he could say most of the catechism distinctly.

[57] William Tredwell Bull to Taylor, Charlestown, South Carolina, August 10, 1715, in S. P. G. MSS., B4, No. 23.

and "had the advancement of God's glory rather than that of trade been the . . . inducement . . . the consequences . . . would not have been . . . so fatal."[58]

Bull was forced from his parish as were many others. The Rev. Will Guy expressed the opinion that, even if peace came soon, it would be a long time before he could hope to see his parish repeopled, because the inhabitants would still remain suspicious of the fidelity of the Indians.[59] The missionary for St. Thomas, Rev. Hasell, wrote to the Society that he could give no account of the state of his parish because most of the men were under arms and everything generally disrupted.[60] St. Bartholomew's Parish was deserted, and the Rev. Nathaniel Osburn was forced to flee.[61] Many of the parishes were without missionaries for eight years or more, among them St. Paul's, St. Bartholomew's, and St. Helen's.[62]

However, Commissary Johnston was optimistic. He declared:

> once the war is over . . . I do not despair, but as much may be done towards conversion of the neighboring Indians as could be hoped for before. And if I am not mistaken, the disposition of these infidels may be supposed to be in, after an unfortunate war, (in which they have been miserably defeated and disappointed) will render them more susceptible of advice, and more willing to hearken to anything which may hereafter be offered to them on this subject.[63]

Unfortunately, in 1716 Commissary Johnston was drowned, and the following year Dr. Le Jau passed away; with the death of these two men the Indian cause lost its most ardent champions.

Francis Varnod, who was sent to South Carolina in 1723, wanted to carry out some of the ideas fostered by Dr. Le Jau. His first letter to the Society from the colony recommended the sending of a young man, in deacon's orders, to go with the traders and settle among the Indians.

[58] *Ibid.*

[59] Will Guy to Taylor, Charlestown, South Carolina, September 20, 1715, *ibid.*, No. 25.

[60] Hasell to [Secretary], St. Thomas, South Carolina, May 26, 1715, in Journal S. P. G., III, October 7, 1715.

[61] Rev. Mr. Nathaniel Osborn to [Secretary], South Carolina, May 27, 1715, *ibid.*

[62] Memorial of the Rev. Mr. William Tredwell Bull to the Society, London, August 16, 1723, in S. P. G. MSS., A17, pp. 39-41. Each missionary was given a half year's salary as a gratuity for the hardships he underwent; also £30 was given to two French ministers, John Lapierre and Philip Richburg, who were in dire circumstances. See David Humphreys, *Historical Account of the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel* (London, 1730), 101.

[63] Johnston to Taylor, Charlestown, South Carolina, December 19, 1715, in S. P. G. MSS., B4, No. 37.

The heathens had a very sedate and tranquil temper, Varnod stated, as compared to the hot and violent temper of the Negroes.

> They are not . . . so destitute of religion as is commonly thought. They entertain a notion of a supreme being . . . they believe that there was . . . an universal flood. . . . Here is a form of prayer used by one of the Indian Kings. . . .
>
> "Thou chief king of all things, let this day be a prosperous one to me, and favor me with the continuance of my being for I thank thee who regardesth me."
>
> And as the Cherokee nation is the most populous, it is to be wished that attempts were made to plant Christianity there first.[64]

The two vices that the Christian whites had taught the Indians, Varnod explained, were drinking and stealing, particularly the former.[65]

Indeed, some of the parishes, after the war, had very few, if any, Indians. Christ Church Parish had no free Indians in 1716.[66] In 1720 Hasell had only about ninety Indian slaves; he reported in his "notitia parochialis" that "none of the uncivilized heathen inhabit constantly in any part of my parish that I know of."[67] Yet, sometimes he would meet a few Ittiwan, who, he learned, had an imperfect notion of two states after death, a good and a bad. By March, 1722, there was one family of free Indians in St. Thomas[68] and by October of the same year there were five.[69] Hasell continued to report a few free Indians in his parish, but, in 1724, he said they were "moving people, often changing their place of habitation, so that I can give no account of their numbers."[70]

[64] Varnod to Humphreys, Dorchester, South Carolina, January 13, 1723, *ibid.*, No. 132. Varnod said the Cherokee were divided into ten tribes, their language was very guttural, and contained a few Hebrew or Phoenician words.

[65] *Id.* to the Society, South Carolina, April 1, 1724, *ibid.*, No. 173. The necessity for traders and missionaries to lead exemplary lives was discussed by Dr. Richard Reynolds, Bishop of Lincoln, in his *A Sermon Preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; At the Parish-Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, On Friday the 16th of February, 1727* . . . (London, 1728). Copy in Huntington Library.

[66] Gilbert Jones to [Secretary], Christ Church Parish, South Carolina, November 6, 1716, in S. P. G. MSS., B4, No. 75.

[67] Hasell to Humphreys, Pompkin Hill, St. Thomas Parish, South Carolina, February 16, 1720, *ibid.*, A14, p. 70.

[68] "Notitia parochialis" accompanying *id.* to *id.*, St. Thomas, South Carolina, March 20, 1721/1722, *ibid.*, B4, No. 103.

[69] "Notitia parochialis" accompanying *id.* to *id.*, St. Thomas, South Carolina, October 20, 1722, *ibid.*, No. 125.

[70] "Notitia parochialis" of Hasell, St. Thomas Parish, South Carolina, April 15, 1724, *ibid.*, 174.

In the same year Brian Hunt reported the number of inhabitants in his parish: 161 white men, 108 white women, 223 children, and 1,479 slaves. All the whites were baptized save a few infants, but "None of the slaves, Indians or negros are baptized save one."[71] He also recorded about ten or twelve families of the Ittiwan Indians, who were straying about from place to place, and were living a wild life. These were a headstrong, idle, stupid people, who seemed incapable of understanding the Christian religion, and few could talk English intelligently; therefore, they continued heathens as all were throughout the province.[72]

Illustrative of the exact information gathered and sent home in reports, is the letter of the Rev. Varnod, who had a census of the Creek Indians taken for him in 1725 by Captain Charlesworth Glover, and the returns showed 1,452 men, 1,560 women, 990 children, or 4,002 Indians altogether.[73] This same report gave the number of Savannah Indians as 30. The count of the Chickasaw, Captain Glover stated, could not be given accurately, because they were distributed among all the other nations. It was also observed that the Indians were declining everywhere except the "Youches" of the Creek tribe, because women frequently murdered their children on the least quarrel between them and their husbands.[74] Although Varnod transmitted this report to the Society, and took an interest in the Indians' conversion, he stated clearly, in 1727, that he had no thoughts of changing his parish "or going among the Indians, finding the last would be expensive and that to no purpose"[75] unless he were twelve or fifteen years younger.

In 1729 the Rev. Thomas Morritt of Winyaw reported that he had about "two or 300 Native Indians scattered about the settlements."[76] By

[71] Brian Hunt to Humphreys, St. John's, South Carolina, May 25, 1724, *ibid.*, No. 179.

[72] *Ibid.*

[73] Captain [Charlesworth] Glover's account of Indian tribes, March 15, 1724/1725, enclosed in Varnod to Humphreys, March 21, 1724/1725, *ibid.*, A19, pp. 92-93. The three provinces noted in the account were: the O'Chaseys or lower province, the Taley Pooses or middle province, and the Abekeers or upper province.

[74] Glover estimated that the women destroyed one fourth of their children (except the Youches) either before or after birth. *Ibid.*

[75] Varnod to Humphreys, Dorchester, South Carolina, January 4, 1726/1727, *ibid.*, B4, No. 194.

[76] Thomas Morritt to *id.*, Winnyaw, South Carolina, September 1, 1729, *ibid.*, No. 234.

1730 there were three families of free Indians in Christ Church Parish, some of whom went to church.[77] In 1731 Varnod registered the baptism of a sambo Indian child in the Uchee Indian town.[78] Five children, baptized in 1736 by Rev. Thomas Thompson of St. Bartholomew's, had an Indian mother.[79] The Rev. John Fordyce of Frederic's Parish in 1737 said he had about 1,100 heathens and infidels but few Indians.[80] In 1740 Thompson reported that he had baptized one free Indian woman, who had earnestly requested it.[81] Rev. Timothy Millechamp, missionary to St. James, Goose Creek, complained in 1741 of the difficulty of making out his "notitia parochialis" because the mountains, inhabited by the Cherokee, were supposed to be in his parish, and he had no way of finding out the number of Indians but he thought there were about 10,000. In his immediate vicinity there were twenty unbaptized Indians.[82] The Rev. Stephen Roe of St. George's said he had about 3,200 heathens and infidels but no wandering Indians.[83] But the Rev. William Orr of St. Paul's Parish had a tribe of 65 Indians called Cussoes. They were sober men and had a notion of a Deity that made them, but did not appear at all concerned to serve him. He intended to use his best efforts to teach them and bring them to a true knowledge of God.[84]

[77] John Fulton to *id.*, Christ Church, South Carolina, December 4, 1730, *ibid.*, A23, p. 222.

[78] Varnod to *id.*, Dorchester, St. George's, South Carolina, August 9, 1731, *ibid.*, B4, No. 249.

[79] Thomas Thompson to *id.*, St. Bartholomew's, South Carolina, May 1, 1736, *ibid.*, No. 266; also in Journal S. P. G., VII, September 17, 1736. These baptisms were made in upper Savannah Town at the garrison kept for the safety of the Indian traders.

[80] Rev. John Fordyce to [Secretary], Frederic's Parish, South Carolina, July 25, 1737, in Journal S. P. G., VII, August 18, 1738.

[81] Thompson to [*id.*], St. Bartholomew's, South Carolina, October 14, 1740, *ibid.*, VIII, January 16, 1740/1741.

[82] Timothy Millechamp to [*id.*], St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, October 15, 1741, *ibid.*, IX, February 19, 1741/1742.

[83] Stephen Roe to [Philip Bearcroft], St. George's Parish, South Carolina, December 28, 1741, in S. P. G. MSS., B10, No. 174.

[84] William Orr to [Secretary], St. Paul's Parish, South Carolina, March 30, 1743, in Journal S. P. G., LX, November 18, 1743. The Society in London, however, held the belief that the Indians were capable of instruction and Christianization. See Dr. Richard Osbaldistone, Bishop of Carlisle, *A Sermon Preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; at their Anniversary Meeting in the Parish Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, On Friday February 21, 1752* (London, 1752). Copy in Huntington Library.

But this attempt, as well as all the other plans, was never converted into a reality. From 1704 to 1715 the missionaries had been formulating ideas for conversion, and, as already indicated, just when it seemed that either the pleas of Dr. Le Jau or Commissary Johnston had not been heard in vain, the Indian War broke out and so completely dispersed the Indians and impoverished the missionaries that new plans had to be started. A few Indians were brought over to the Christian side from 1715 to 1765, as has been stated, but the majority of them were still heathens when the first rumblings of the American Revolution were heard. The whites, by this time, had not yet been able to understand the Indian. The colonists had always been fearful of an Indian attack ever since the war in 1715. In 1725 the Rev. Richard Ludham of Goose Creek had explained, "As matters stand with us we make use of a wile for our present security to make the Indians and negroes a check upon each other lest by their vastly superior numbers we should be crushed by one or the other."[85] Evidently this scheme worked well for some time, because in 1759 the Rev. Alexander Garden wrote to David Humphreys that the province of South Carolina had so far enjoyed a profound peace.[86] Yet he reported,

> we are now likely to be engaged in a dangerous Indian war with the Cherokee Nation. One half of the Inhabitants from the Age 16 to 60 years are drawn but to march at an hours warning, and our Governor is set out with a Body of Men for that Country. . . . So that I am affraid Religion will make but little Progress amidst these Confusions.[87]

Between 1760 and 1763 the missionaries were reporting the attacks of the Cherokee, and the flight of many parishioners. Furthermore, in 1759 the Society had decided not to fill up the missions as they were vacated because "the Colonists were . . . building and endowing Churches and Schools."[88] For some years the Indians, withdrawing, had been twenty

[85] Richard Ludlam to Humphreys, Goose Creek, South Carolina [ca. March], 1725, in S. P. G. MSS., A19, pp. 66-67.

[86] Alexander Garden to *id.*, Charlestown, South Carolina, October 31, 1759, *ibid.*, B4, No. 284; also in Journal S. P. G., XIV, April 18, 1760.

[87] *Ibid.*

[88] C. F. Pascoe, *Two Hundred Years of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts,* 2 vols. (London, 1901), I, 18. The last vacancy, Pascoe states, was in 1766,

miles distant, then fifty, then three hundred miles away from the center of the white man's parish and settlement. The search for the adventurous type of missionary, willing to live at higher altitudes, to migrate with the Indian to learn his language and to bear the hardships and dangers of his isolation, became more difficult as the Indian increased his distance from the border regions.[89]

In South Carolina, as in many other places, the missionary represented imperial as well as Protestant missionary zeal. He therefore regarded the Roman Catholic missionary to the south of him in Spanish lands and the French missionary in the Mississippi Valley with double hostility, as encroaching upon British territories on behalf of their own governments, and as spreading non-Anglican teachings. Unfortunately, the Indian was in the position of a migratory buffer state, with the long-armed tentacles of rival fur and other traders from the three powers pulling the tribes apart either by actual kidnapping or by means of internal fratricidal conflict. Troubles never came singly, and Indian uprisings, wars, and rumors of war, the decimation and flight of the Indians were followed almost immediately by the death of two men of outstanding ability and imagination—Commissary Johnston and Dr. Le Jau, of whose total work only a fragment is here presented. No one rose to take their places, hence the unequal fight for Indian Christianization for the next fifty years fell into faithful but less skilled hands, as the ever restless white man moved relentlessly westward.[90]

During the formative period of the Society's work, when its plans, organization, and mature strength were still in the future, reports from its wide front were reaching London from all over the colonies. South Carolina was a strategic sphere of experiment and achievement; its treble frontier against the Indian, Frenchman, and the Spaniard, the close connection with the West Indies and with the Northern colonies

but in 1770 Rev. Mr. S. F. Lucius was sent to Coffee Town at the request of the inhabitants to be the Society's missionary until the close of the Revolution.

[89] For a thoughtful analysis of the missionary's function, see the statements made by Lodwick C. Hartley, in his penetrating *William Cowper, Humanitarian* (Chapel Hill, 1938), 97-111.

[90] A separate study of Dr. Le Jau's work among the Negroes will provide additional material for analysis and appraisal.

through the great port of the South, brought many-sided interests into focus. Charleston was the port of entry for both the Carolinas and for Georgia and occupied the position which New York later was to have for a wide area.

British traders in this wide area made contacts with the Indian tribes as far west as the Mississippi River, establishing a superiority over both Spanish and French traders. The force of this rivalry in trade and influence was destructive of Indian tribal life, and of Spanish missionary enterprise, success of which is reflected in the reports of the S. P. G. missionary. On the British side, in this struggle for continental boundaries, the trader occupied first place and eventually was able to bring imperial support to his side. The missionary, not wanted by the trader on the frontier, was, nevertheless, though outdistanced, a reporter of the white man's impact on the Indian. On the other side of these buffer regions, the Spanish and French priest and soldier, often first on the scene, were to be overwhelmed by British colonial and imperial forces. However, zones of former Latin occupancy, whether Spanish or French, could not be wholly obliterated.[91]

[91] For a comparative study of this double frontier, see the Introduction, entitled "The Debatable Land, A Sketch of the Anglo-Spanish Contest for the Georgia Country," in Herbert E. Bolton, *Arredondo's Historical Proof of Spain's Title to Georgia* (Berkeley, 1925), 1-110. See, also, Verner W. Crane, "The Southern Frontier in Queen Anne's War," in *American Historical Review,* XXIV (1919), 379-95. For a definitive analysis of pioneer conditions in South Carolina and of colonial relations with the Indians, the Spaniards, and the French, see Verner W. Crane, *The Southern Frontier, 1670-1732* (Durham, 1928). Professor Crane availed himself of the pertinent materials in the archives and libraries of Great Britain and the United States, including the records of the English missionary societies. A comprehensive bibliography and an excellent map are provided.

Nathaniel A. Ware, National Economist

By WILLIAM DIAMOND

One of the products of the boisterous nationalism and optimism of the late twenties, thirties, and forties in the United States was the development of what has come to be known as the American nationalist school of political economy. Stemming directly from Alexander Hamilton and the Federalist tradition, this school—through Mathew Carey, Daniel Raymond, John Rae, Hezekiah Niles, to Henry C. Carey—was struck by the great material differences between Europe and America. In contrast to Europe's density of population, superfluity of labor, and insufficiency of land, these men found America sparsely settled and lacking sufficient population to make an impression on its tremendous frontiers. In America they witnessed a diversity of economic phenomena and a freedom from limitation unparalleled in Europe. In short, planted in an environment totally different from that of Europe, in an environment of unheard-of wealth, these men believed themselves faced with the necessity of rejecting the classical political economy of Adam Smith, Malthus, and Ricardo, and of espousing the idea that all economic principles are relative to time and place, that political economy is an art and not a science. As Raymond succinctly put it, he wished to "break loose from the fetters of foreign authority—from foreign theories and systems of political economy, which from the dissimilarity in the nature of the governments, renders them altogether unsuited to our country."[1]

These men broke from the Smithian tradition and adopted a theory of economic development requiring a large degree of national control. The nationalist school was, in a sense, neomercantilist. It was concerned pri-

[1] Daniel Raymond, *Thoughts on Political Economy* (Baltimore, 1820), v-vi.

marily, not with the individual, but with the state as a national unit and with its prosperity and wealth. The heart of the nationalist doctrine lay in the concept of national productive capacity, and it rejected the idea that the wealth of a nation is equal to the sum of the wealth of its individuals. Its aim was the harmony of all interests within the nation under the supremacy of the Federal government. The main point in its program declared that the proper means to this desirable end was the congressional legislation of protective tariffs and internal improvements.[2]

The nationalists were generally Northerners by birth as well as in economic and political ideas. One of the least known figures in the nationalist school, however, is Nathaniel A. Ware, a Southerner "by birth and interest."[3] Self-identified with the Southern states, a banker, planter,

[2] John R. Turner, *The Ricardian Theory in Early American Economics* (New York, 1921); T. E. C. Leslie, "Political Economy in the United States," in *Fortnightly Review* (London, 1865-), n.s., XXVIII (1880), 488-509; Kenneth W. Rowe, *Mathew Carey: A Study in American Economic Development,* in Johns Hopkins University *Studies in Historical and Political Science,* LI, No. 4 (Baltimore, 1933); George G. Stone, *Hezekiah Niles as an Economist, ibid.,* No. 5 (Baltimore, 1933); A. D. H. Kaplan, *Henry C. Carey: A Study in American Economic Thought, ibid.,* XLIX, No. 4 (Baltimore, 1931).

[3] There has so far been no adequate sketch of Ware's life. Biographical information must be gleaned from many sources, primary and secondary. There is a brief sketch by Broadus Mitchell in the *Dictionary of American Biography,* 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), XIX, 451; and in *Palgrave's Dictionary of Political Economy,* 3 vols. (London, 1923-1926), III, 805-806. These encyclopedias are the only two containing accounts which recognize and discuss Ware's associations with the nationalist school. There are also brief paragraphs in most of the encyclopedias of American biography, all of which are in substantial agreement and of little value. Information on Ware will be found in biographical sketches of his daughter, Catherine Ann Warfield, in *Library of Southern Literature,* 16 vols. (De Luxe ed., New Orleans, Atlanta, Dallas, 1909-1913), XII, 5617-19; Mary Forrest [Julia Deane Freeman], *Women of the South Distinguished in Literature* (New York, 1866); Ida Raymond [M. T. Tardy], *Southland Writers,* 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1870). Of some value, too, are Dunbar Rowland, *Courts, Judges, and Lawyers of Mississippi, 1798-1935* (Jackson, 1935), which gives some information about Ware's appointments during his Mississippi days; and *The Official and Statistical Register of Mississippi, 1924-28* (Jackson, n.d.), which does the same. Of primary sources of information, the most valuable are two in number: Clarence E. Carter (ed.), *The Territorial Papers of the United States,* VI, *The Territory of Mississippi, 1809-1817* (Washington, 1938). Cited hereafter as *Territory of Mississippi, 1809-1817.* It contains letters to, by, and about Ware during his residence in Mississippi as a government official. The volume also contains valuable references to letters concerning Ware in the Appointment Office files of the State Department. The second source is the "Executive Journal of Governor Holmes, 1814-1817," MSS. now in the Territorial Papers Division of the State Department and soon to be deposited in The National Archives. Additional bibliography will be cited in other footnotes.

and slaveowner, he was nevertheless an ardent nationalist. A government official in early manhood, he acquired a fortune, became a gentleman of leisure in Philadelphia, and later a speculator and perhaps a manufacturer; he traveled widely, acquired an interest in science, especially in its application to intensive agriculture, and developed an enthusiasm for the "Harmony of Interests." He was clearly and definitely a neomercantilist. His economic doctrine, coinciding in so many ways with that of the nationalist school and of the Southern Whig slavocracy of which he was a member, differed occasionally from both. He was as much a belligerent Whig of the Clay National Republican faction as a national economist.

Little is known of the life of Nathaniel W. Ware, and that little is often questionable, largely fragmentary, and gives no adequate picture of the man. Ware was born in South Carolina, perhaps in Abbeville, either in 1780 or 1789.[4] He taught school for a while and at the same time studied and perhaps even practiced law. Sometime before May, 1811, he removed to Mississippi Territory, probably to the town of Natchez. There he was commissioned an attorney at law.[5] Ware was never, in all probability, an eminent lawyer; there is no evidence that he ever made an extensive professional use of his legal training after he left Mississippi in 1820 or 1821. When the War of 1812 began, he became active in support of the United States, joined the militia, and acquired the rank of major. It is probable that at this early period Ware was a Jeffersonian Republican.

[4] The determination of the state in which Ware was born seems fairly certain. The biographical encyclopedias are divided between Abbeville, South Carolina, and Massachusetts, and 1780 and 1789. *Appleton's Cyclopedia of American Biography,* for instance, in its 1889 edition (VI, 358), gives Massachusetts, 1789; and in its 1915 edition (VI, no paging), Abbeville, 1780. While the writer has not been willing to agree on a date for Ware's birth, he has decided upon South Carolina as its scene on the basis of three independent bits of evidence. Ware's *Notes on Political Economy* claims the author was a Southerner "by birth and interest." A letter from Josiah Simpson, dated March 28, 1815, recommending Ware for the secretaryship of Mississippi, states he was "a native of South Carolina" (see n. 7). A great-grandson of Ware has informed the writer that he "thinks" Ware was born in South Carolina. The evidence seems sufficient.

[5] Register of Appointments, 1805-1812, p. 88. For partnership with Thomas B. Reed, see Washington *Republican,* August 18, 1813. Both cited in Rowland, *Courts, Judges, and Lawyers of Mississippi,* 73-74.

Very early in his career in Mississippi, Ware became associated with the territorial government. From January, 1813, until Mississippi was admitted to the Union in 1817, he held office as member of the Legislative Council and of the House of Representatives, as secretary and as acting governor of the Territory.[6] During this time he had both friends and enemies; by the former at least he was recognized as an able and respected man who could be expected to fill any office creditably. He was once recommended as a "gentleman of highly respectable legal acquirements, of a very capacious, vigorous, and enlightened mind, and of most inflexible integrity."[7] Yet, in 1817 his efforts to secure election to Congress and to the Mississippi constitutional convention both resulted in failure.[8] Meanwhile, he had amassed a considerable fortune as a result of land speculation.

In 1814 Ware married Mrs. Sarah Percy Ellis, daughter of a British naval officer and an early settler in Louisiana.[9] To them was born in 1816 a daughter, Catherine Ann, who was later to make a reputation for herself as a Southern novelist and poet.[10] With the birth of their second daughter, four years later, a new phase of Ware's life began. His wife,

[6] The outlines of Ware's legislative and executive career may be pieced together from various items in the following sources: Carter (ed.), *Territory of Mississippi, 1809-1817,* pp. 196, 302-303, 354, 384, 414, 417, 418, 447-48, 421-22, 526-27, 541, 553-56, 560, 691-92, 704, 719-20, 789, 794; *Official and Statistical Register of Mississippi, 1924-28,* pp. 17, 22; Ware to Thomas B. Robertson, February 26, 1815 (enclosed in Robertson to the Secretary of State, March 25, 1815); Calhoun to the President, April 2, 1815; Josiah Simpson to the Secretary of State, March 28, 1815 (all in the Appointment Office files of the State Department); "Executive Journal of Governor Holmes, 1814-1817."

[7] Simpson to the Secretary of State, March 28, 1815 (Appointment Office files of the State Department). Twelve members of the Mississippi House of Representatives in a petition to the President, once objected to Ware's appointment to office on the grounds that his politics were not "strictly Republican" and that he "has no permanent residence in the Territory." Carter (ed.), *Territory of Mississippi, 1809-1817,* pp. 421-22.

[8] Washington *Republican,* January 22, May 21, 1817, cited in Rowland, *Courts, Judges, and Lawyers of Mississippi,* 74; Dunbar Rowland, "Mississippi's First Convention," in Mississippi Historical Society, *Publications* (Oxford, etc., 1897-1914, Centenary Series, 1916-1925), VI (1902), 81-82.

[9] Mitchell, "Nathaniel A. Ware," in *loc. cit.,* 451; Washington *Republican,* September 7, 1814, cited in Rowland, *Courts, Judges, and Lawyers of Mississippi,* 74; [Freeman], *Women of the South,* 114; [Tardy], *Southland Writers,* I, 26.

[10] Grant C. Knight, "Catherine Ann Ware Warfield," in *Dictionary of American Biography,* XIX, 454.

suffering from puerperal fever, became insane, and the care and education of the two girls fell upon his shoulders.

From 1820 to his death thirty-four years later, it is impossible to trace Ware's movements with any degree of certainty. Apparently he sold his estates and went with his family to Philadelphia, partly in a vain attempt to cure his suffering wife, partly for the sake of the education of his daughters.[11] For at least a year, from the spring of 1822, Ware was a commissioner for the adjudication of land claims in Florida, and spent a large part of his time there.[12] He probably returned to Philadelphia immediately thereafter. Passionately devoted to his daughters, he made every effort to educate them properly. Believing that education by the book must be supplemented by travel, he devoted a portion of each year to wandering in both North and South. He was apparently a man of leisure at the time, and was never long separated from his daughters. He finally settled definitely in Philadelphia.[13]

Meanwhile, in October, 1823, Ware had been elected to membership in the American Philosophical Society, the intellectual focus of Philadelphia.[14] In that city, and through the Society, Ware may have met men who exercised a profound influence on his thinking and oriented it in the direction later apparent in his writings on political economy—such men as DeWitt Clinton, the New York governor whose canal was a model for internal improvements, Mathew and Henry C. Carey, the well-known economists, Edward Everett, Nicholas Biddle, of the United States Bank, Isaac Lea, Franklin Bache, and others. The Society was a

[11] [Freeman], *Women of the South,* 114; [Tardy], *Southland Writers,* I, 27.

[12] A letter from Andrew Jackson to Dr. James C. Bronaugh, May 29, 1822, in John S. Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson,* 6 vols. (Washington, 1926-1933), III, 163, indicates that Ware held some such position. Letters from Ware and Samuel R. Overton, commissioners, to President Monroe, August 24, 1822, and to Secretary John Q. Adams, August 25, 1822, may be found in State Papers, Misc. Let. 88, July and August, 1822, and to Adams again, October 21, 1822, in Misc. Let. 89, September and October, 1822, MSS. in The National Archives. A fourth letter from Overton to Monroe, July 10, 1823, in Misc. Let. 95, July and August, 1823, indicates that Ware had just resigned. There is a letter from Ware to Overton, December 29, 1822, in the New York Public Library.

[13] [Freeman], *Women of the South,* 114-15; [Tardy], *Southland Writers,* I, 27-29.

[14] Elected October 17, 1823. *List of the Members of the American Philosophical Society* (Philadelphia, 1838).

vast repository of information, and Ware probably made good use of it. At this time, too, Mathew Carey was at the height of his power and influence as a force in American economic life. It is highly probable that Ware knew him and was a member of his circle. A letter written by Ware during this Philadelphia period shows that he was already keenly interested in American manufacturing and was taking pains to acquire data not only for cotton, his main interest, but for wool and iron as well.[15] Early in 1831 Ware made an effort to establish a cotton manufactory in Texas, but the plan never materialized—partly, at least, because of the failure of a New Orleans company to which he had loaned money.[16]

After a brief interval in Cincinnati and a year in France, he next appeared as a wealthy landowner and prominent banker of Natchez. In New York on July 5, 1839, Ware, "whose name carried weight," was the first of fourteen prominent Southern bankers and planters to sign a circular "To the Cotton Planters, Merchants, Factors, and Presidents and Directors of the several Banks of the Southern States" calling a convention to deliberate upon a scheme "for the protection of our Commerce, Finance, and Exchange." The manifesto proposed "a system by which, with the commencement of the new crop, advances on cotton shall be made with the capital or credit of banks here, thereby relieving the consignee in Europe from all care or consideration, except the advantageous sale of his stock." Through arrangements with English manufacturers and the Bank of England, Southern banks would make advances to planters and, on presentation of the proper bills of lading, the banks would issue "Post Notes" which would circulate freely. Ware was probably present at the convention which met in Macon, Georgia, in October, 1839, just as the banks were suspending specie payments in the Southern states and notes were depreciating. The convention adopted resolutions heartily approving the Cotton Circular. Ware was appointed

[15] Ware to Josiah S. Johnston, September 18, 1825, in the collections of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia.

[16] Eugene C. Barker (ed.), *The Austin Papers,* II, in American Historical Association, *Annual Report,* 1922 (Washington, 1928), 605-606, 613-15, 619, 633-34, 681-82, 691. The first volume of this work was published in the *Annual Report,* 1919 (Washington, 1924); the third by the University of Texas (Austin, 1926).

to the committee for Natchez to make necessary arrangements to carry the plan into effect.[17] But the effort, like so many others based on cotton notes, came to naught.[18]

The following years of Ware's life are even more hazy. He remained a Southern planter and slaveowner. From 1844 to 1848 he wrote at least three books.[19] Once again, apparently, he became interested in Texas. He died of yellow fever in 1854, in or near Galveston, where he had apparently invested very heavily in lands.[20] The fact that Ware's daughter was later the owner of considerable lands in Texas[21] may indicate that he held extensive interests there.

It would seem that Ware was a man of broad scientific and intellectual interests. He was interested in botany, geography, the natural sciences, and agriculture, as well as in education and politics. He was familiar with contemporary economic conditions, at home and abroad. Ware's daughter, whom he encouraged in her literary activities, claimed for him a profound learning, but a reserved, shy, even eccentric nature. He was bitter and morose, the result of domestic troubles, even to his friends and children. Ware has been described as a "philosopher of the

[17] Dunbar Rowland, *History of Mississippi, the Heart of the South,* 2 vols. (Chicago, 1925), I, 604-605; *id., Encyclopedia of Mississippi History,* 2 vols. (Madison, 1907), II, 158-59, 928-29. The text of the Circular may be found in *Hazard's United States Commercial and Statistical Register* (Philadelphia, 1839-1842), I (1840), 90-92. For the report of the Macon convention, see *ibid.,* 321-24; *Niles' Weekly Register* (Baltimore, 1811-1849), LVII (1839-1840), 184-87.

[18] James L. Watkins, *King Cotton* (New York, 1908), 103; Mitchell, "Nathaniel A. Ware," in *loc. cit.,* 451.

[19] The Boston Public Library has attributed to Ware a series of "Letters on Haiti," published in a slender volume entitled *The Rural Code of Haiti . . . Together with Letters from that Country, By a Southern Planter* (Granville, Middletown, N. J., 1837). The auspices under which the letters were published, the differences in style between them and the *Notes on Political Economy,* the practically irreconcilable inconsistency in the opinions on slavery and Negroes expressed in the two books make it evident that Ware could not have been the author of the "Letters on Haiti." The Library of Congress possesses a copy of *The Rural Code of Haiti,* but attributes the "Letters" to no one. As a result of a detailed analysis of these reasons, the Boston Public Library has accepted the conclusions of the writer.

[20] In 1848 he purchased some land near Waco, Texas. Lucy A. Erath, "Memoirs of George Bernard Erath," in *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (Austin, 1897-), XXVII (1923-1924), 147. Announcement of Ware's death was made by his step son-in-law at the January 20, 1854, meeting of the American Philosophical Society, *Proceedings* (Philadelphia, 1838-), VI (1859), 5.

[21] [Tardy], *Southland Writers,* I, 32.

school of Voltaire, a fine scholar, with a pungent, acrid wit, and cold sarcasm." He was a handsome man, "his complexion pure and fair as a young girl's, his cheeks freshly colored, his brow white as a lily,—a very venerable looking man, with long, thin, white locks falling on his neck," and with aquiline nose, high, narrow forehead, and bright eyes.[22]

In 1844 Ware wrote *Notes on Political Economy as Applicable to the United States. By a Southern Planter.*[23] In the following year he produced a jeremiad, fairly reeking of pessimism and forebodings of anarchy and ruin, in the form of *An Exposition of the Weakness and Inefficiency of the Government of the United States of North America.*[24] This volume has never before been associated with Ware; it has always been attributed to Charles Fenton Mercer, a Virginian, member of Congress, president of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, and active leader in the colonization movement for many years. However, investigation of the District Court Copyright Records of Ohio for the year 1845 brings to light an application for copyright of *An Exposition* made out by Nathaniel A. Ware as *proprietor.*[25] The title page of the book contains the imprint "Printed for the Author. 1845." The inference that Ware was the author is therefore inescapable. Further, the title page of a book written by Ware three years later is extraordinarily similar to that of *An Exposition.* Both are anonymous; both were "Printed for the Author"; neither contains, on either side of the title page, the name of the copyright owner. The formats of the title pages are similar in type face and

[22] *Ibid.*, 26-27, 31; [Freeman], *Women of the South,* 115.

[23] Published by Leavitt, Trow, and Company at New York, 1844. All sketches of Ware's life mention this volume. Although published pseudonymously, most libraries attribute the volume to him. The only contemporary evidence the writer has been able to find is the fact that Ware is referred to as author of the *Notes,* and quotations from the volume are given in John Pickering, *The Working Man's Political Economy, Founded Upon the Principles of Immutable Justice, and the Inalienable Rights of Man; Designed for the Promotion of National Reform* (Cincinnati, 1847). See, for example, pp. 34, 35-36, 38, 67.

[24] N.p., 1845. Cited hereafter as *An Exposition.* Copyright was taken out in Cincinnati. The book was reprinted as *The Weakness and Inefficiency of the Government of the United States . . . By a Late American Statesman. Edited by a Member of the Middle Temple, London* (London, 1863).

[25] Credit for the discovery of this fact, as well as the gratitude of the writer, is due Mr. V. Alta Parma, Curator of the Rare Book Collection of the Library of Congress. The District Court Records containing copyrights are in the Rare Book Collection.

make-up, and the word "Printed" in both is identical. Again the inference is that Ware was the author. It is noteworthy, too, that it is generally agreed in nearly all sketches of his life that Ware wrote a book on views of the Federal Constitution. This is undoubtedly *An Exposition.*

An internal examination of the volume yields precisely the same conclusion. There is no evidence whatsoever that Mercer was the author; everything points to Ware. For example, the preface to *An Exposition* declares the author "stands identified"[26] with America, and claims he has held offices in "Judicial, Legislative and Executive parts thereof." Mercer had only legislative positions in the government. Ware held executive and legislative positions in Mississippi Territory and, as commissioner of land claims in Florida, he held a quasi-judicial post. The preface claims the author acted "during thirty years of his life, with the Jeffersonian Democracy," and changed only gradually. Mercer had always been either a Federalist or a Whig. The preface claims the author had a family of children and grandchildren. Mercer never married. Ware had two children and, by this time, probably several grandchildren. It is significant that the only lengthy secondary treatment of Mercer, although attributing *An Exposition* to him, is tinged with the distinct feeling that it was out of harmony with Mercer's views.[27] A sketch of Mercer's life written by himself in 1849 contains no mention of *An Exposition* despite the fact that he wrote of how busy he had been since his retirement from Congress at the end of 1839, and even gave examples of what he had done.[28]

The text of the volume itself is so similar to that of *Notes on Political Economy* that one might conclude that the writer had the *Notes* open before him as he wrote. There are identical passages and identical expressions. With the exception of a slight but insignificant difference in attitude toward slavery and war, there is no difference in opinion or point

[26] *An Exposition,* vii. Precisely the same expression is used in the Preface to the *Notes,* iii.

[27] W. F. Dunaway, "Charles Fenton Mercer" (thesis in the library of the University of Chicago, 1917), 58-59. The author mistakenly asserts that *An Exposition* was posthumous.

[28] "Materials for a Life of C. F. Mercer," in James Mercer Garnett, *Biographical Sketch of Hon. Charles Fenton Mercer, 1778-1858* (Richmond, 1911).

of view between *An Exposition* and *Notes on Political Economy.*[29] The style is the same—vigorous, relatively dull and harsh, highly repetitious.

In 1848 Ware wrote a novel entitled *Harvey Belden: or a True Narrative of Strange Adventures. By the Author of "Notes on Political Economy," and "A Treatise On the Natural Method of Education."*[30] Sketches of his life generally agree in attributing to him a small work on the Pestalozzian system of education, which is undoubtedly *A Treatise,* no copy of which can be found. Furthermore, a biographer of Ware's daughter claimed he wrote a *"geographical"* novel.[31] This is probably *Harvey Belden,* which is the story of the son of a rich and respectable Scotch gentleman who, drifting out to sea in a small boat, is found just in time to save his life. With this as a beginning, the novel carries its hero through adventures and misadventures across most of the world—through Portugal, Morocco, the Sahara, eastward across Africa, Persia, India, and China—until the young man is reunited with his father on the Mississippi. The novel seems to have no particular point or moral.

A cursory examination of the files of some of the better contemporary journals, especially on economics, reveals no review or notice of the *Notes on Political Economy,* with which the following discussion will be largely concerned—despite the fact that a biographer of Ware's daughter

[29] Cf., for example, passage on reciprocity, *An Exposition,* 108-109, *Notes,* 159-60; passage on Federal courts, *An Exposition,* 25, *Notes,* 25; remarks on Lancastrian system and Girard fund, *An Exposition,* 270, 271, *Notes,* 261, 262-63; passage on slave-run factories, *An Exposition,* 175-76, *Notes,* 31. Note recurrence of expression, "a road, a canal, or a bridge," *Notes,* 266-67, *An Exposition,* 118, 145, 213, 249. At greater length, compare full chapters and sections on mails and the use of franks, in which precisely the same points are made, using the same data, *An Exposition,* 215-20, 370-73, *Notes,* 276-82; on suffrage, *An Exposition,* 38-71, *Notes,* 285 ff., 294 ff.; on the tariff, *An Exposition,* 31-38, *Notes,* 22-35, 89-101. The error of crediting Mercer with the authorship of *An Exposition* probably lies with Joseph Sabin (ed.), *Bibliotheca Americana, A Dictionary of Books Relating to America from Its Discovery to the Present Time,* 29 vols. (New York, 1868-1936), XII (1880), 53-54. I have been unable to find any contemporary connection of the volume with Mercer.

[30] Cincinnati, 1848. Credit for the discovery of the novel is, again, due Mr. V. Alta Parma. The only known copy came into his possession early in 1938 and is now in the Henry E. Huntington Library.

[31] [Tardy], *Southland Writers,* I, 27. The technique of the novel is similar to that of Voltaire in *Candide*—one adventure after another, escape, capture, escape, and recapture, and travel over a large area. There may or may not be any connection between this fact and the statement, on the page cited, that Ware was a "scholar of the school of Voltaire."

claimed Ware's two works on political economy "made some reputation for him among the class of men who take interest in such reasonings."[32]

The *Notes on Political Economy,* published in the year of an election, is so thoroughly Whig doctrine as expounded by a Southern aristocrat that it is difficult to avoid the possibility that it was written as campaign propaganda. In the election of 1844, the Whigs "stood out distinctly as the champions of the Union."[33] It requires but a cursory glance at the *Notes* to see that it too was essentially an appeal for support of the Union against sectional, class, and perverse interests. What little we know of Ware marks him as a man of culture and broad interests, with Northern contacts and economic and sentimental ties to the South. This, added to the doctrine enunciated in the *Notes,* where his aristocratic leanings are as evident as his protectionism and nationalism, fits very nicely into the picture of the Southern Whig slaveowner.[34] Ware's is certainly the voice of Southern Whiggery, with modifications produced by the influence of the nationalist economists. Nor was it alone. The severe depression which hit the South from 1838 to 1844 called forth a host of economic writings, and it succeeded in turning many planters to protectionist doctrine.[35]

The *Notes* was written in the course of two years, and so repetitious are its chapters that it would seem they were written at intervals and with little consecutive thought. The volume is abundant in inconsistencies and is by no means a systematic treatment of the subject. There are two dominant ideas which color the entire volume—the second of which forms the connective thread that unites the chapters as well as the excuse for the publication of the book. The first is the concept of relativity in economic doctrine, the idea that economics must be based upon the con-

[32] [Tardy], *Southland Writers,* I, 27. The second book on economics may, perhaps, be *An Exposition.* I can find no other book attributable to Ware.

[33] Arthur C. Cole, *The Whig Party in the South* (Washington, 1913), 114.

[34] See *ibid.,* 39-104. See, also, Charles S. Sydnor, *A Gentleman of the Old Natchez Region, Benjamin L. C. Wailes* (Durham, 1938).

[35] Ulrich B. Phillips, "Economic and Political Essays," in *The South in the Building of the Nation,* 13 vols. (Richmond, 1909-1913), VII, 176; *id.,* "The Southern Whigs," in *Turner Essays in American History* (New York, 1910), 216. Phillips is the only author this writer has found who actually identifies Ware with Southern Whiggery. See n. 75.

tingencies of time, place, and circumstance; the second is the concept of a national economy, autarchic in character, based upon the harmony of all interests within the nation. It was the vision of an American system which Ware held before him as he wrote, a system which bore a more than incidental resemblance to that of Henry Clay. But, as in the case of Mathew Carey who held the same ideal, an examination of Ware's doctrine yields no "systematic treatise or harmonious economy theory, but a set of rules by which America might direct its economic life."[36]

Ware defined his political economy, in almost the same terms as Carey, as a "science that embraces and regards all measures calculated to advance the prosperity of a nation." It was essentially a practical science. Smith and Jean Baptiste Say, he believed, were far "too abstract and theoretical for common use." For the subject matter of political economy must be dealt with simply and in such a way as to be understood by the plain working man. Political economy must be empirical; theories must proceed from facts. For to Ware, as to Raymond, Rae, Carey, and Friedrich List, the golden rule of political economy was summed up in the phrase "governed by circumstances."[37] He saw no absolute and unique truth for all nations (though, to be sure, he later indicated that all nations become wealthy in proportion to their manufacturing and protection). Like all the nationalist writers, Ware considered the dogmas of the European classical school invalid because of their affirmed universality and entirely unsuited to the United States—which he saw as a new continent with a rapidly increasing population and expanding economy and with almost infinite capacities in land, in natural resources, and in the skill and ingenuity of its people.

Ware distinguished between national and individual wealth, a separation which was more explicit in others of the Carey nationalist group. The heart of his economics lay in the concept, peculiar to the nationalists, of a national productive capacity as the essence of the wealth of the nation. As he said, all his reasoning on protection "applies to the capital or income of a people, nationally speaking; not to individuals." No mat-

[36] Rowe, *Mathew Carey*, 67.
[37] *Notes on Political Economy*, 1-3.

ter how the national income is divided, it is still realized by the nation.[38]

It was with this in mind that Ware devoted almost the entire volume of *Notes on Political Economy* to protection and the encouragement of manufactures which, he was certain, was the expedient and necessary policy for the United States if it ever wished to free itself from European (English) domination and assume among the powers of the earth the position which nature and its people are able to provide.

Although Ware saw that until nations were "similarly circumstanced," free trade meant a sort of international slavery, he, like Hamilton before him and Henry C. Carey with him, believed that free trade would be the ultimate product of society, when all nations had fully developed their own resources. Until that day arrived, "the nations of the world will struggle to undersell and overreach each other; and one portion, the active, the free, the skilful, will grow rich and absorb all the capital of the world; and the ignorant, the indolent, the badly governed, and the weak powers, will stand exhausted to such a degree, that at last, from every necessity, they will have to wake up and supply themselves." Once this day had arrived—as it was certain to arrive in the not far distant future—the trade of the world would be only in raw materials and in goods that could not be produced at home.[39]

Protection was intended to persuade the capitalist to invest money by insuring him against the losses resulting from the transference of capital and the lack of skill and experience that accompany any new enterprise. This bounty, perhaps temporarily a tax, would in the end be worth while, since it would have induced capital and skill into new channels, built up competition, increased the quality and quantity and lowered the prices of goods.[40] Its aim was to foster manufacturing and hence national self-sufficiency. Only a "bold and far-fetched" distortion of the Constitution could deny to Congress the power to pass protective legislation.[41] And with America in possession of all the essentials of a powerful industrial state, with an abundance of labor, ready capital, tremendous resources in

[38] *Ibid.*, 172-73.
[39] *Ibid.*, 190-92.
[40] *Ibid.*, 66, 9-11.
[41] *Ibid.*, 22.

raw materials, and a people of great capacity, intelligence, and ingenuity, there could be no doubt that manufacturing must not "be left to individual exertions, in other words, to chance," that the "attention and protection of the government" must be invoked "to ensure its proper success and development."[42] With manufactures supported by protection and as the basis of the national economy, the United States must and would prosper. For all the interests and sections of the nation would then be directed toward one end—a true harmony of interests.

> To the patriot, a picture of prosperity and national independence is presented that cannot fail to please and delight him,—to the statesman, enough to bring him into the support of all that is wanted to complete and effectuate its realities,—to the agriculturist, a rich harvest and a varied resource,—to the merchant, a better basis of trade, with certain wealth, and fewer dangers,—to the capitalist, a certain and sure employment for his money, and every prospect of an increase of it,—to the slaveholder, some hope of more profit,—and to the manufacturer, the gratitude of his country, as well as a harvest of wealth and comfort. Nothing is wanting but a single act of Congress, giving, in the first instance, the home market, which would be inducement enough to realize the whole, and cover all the ground. Let us up and act, and make our country worth living in.[43]

With this as his goal, Ware elaborated a plan for eradicating unemployment, increasing agricultural production, and—most important of all—increasing manufacturing, all based on the transportation of rural populations to cities, the reapportionment of employment, and the reclaiming of souls lost through vice, drink, and idleness. The protective bounty would be the means of all this. Manufacturing, encouraged by high tariffs, would create a demand for labor, which would be supplied from three sources: from agricultural groups, 1,000,000, including women and children, who are as valuable as men in factories; from cities, villages, and fishing districts, 500,000; slaves, 400,000; miscellaneous, 100,000. In short, a total of 2,000,000 could be removed from unproductive pursuits in various places and made available as manufacturing labor. This would leave agriculture not only unclogged but in possession of a new market. Dens of vice would be cleared out, and the idle taken from the streets to become more virtuous, happy, and comfortable. In addition, the 2,000,000 would be vastly increased "from the

[42] *Ibid.*, 25, 26, 35-53.
[43] *Ibid.*, 157. See, also, 60-61.

very circumstance of protection giving a certainty of employment, by bringing or inducing thousands of the best and most skilful laborers from Europe, and establishing them in this country."[44]

It was primarily from the point of view of factory employment that Ware was interested in labor, and so much so that he believed "the first duty . . . of all good government, is to look to its labor; insure it not only full occupation, but the greatest productiveness. Political economy abhors idleness worse, if possible, than nature does a vacuum."[45] For labor, as Adam Smith posited, was the foundation of all wealth and capital.[46] Yet it could not govern wages, Ware believed, for competition of labor and machinery would bring wages down to subsistence level and "in the run of things man . . . [was] destined to sell himself for bread and clothes, and perhaps brown bread and rags at that." Nor could labor have a hand in price, for price—here Ware followed the lead of Ricardo's American imitators—was mechanically governed by supply and demand alone.[47]

This emphasis on manufacturing may seem unusual in a planter, but Ware found opportunity to pay at least perfunctory respects to agriculture, which, he wrote somewhat inconsistently, was "the real basis of the world's prosperity and support," "the very foundation of our subsistence and wealth." Early in the volume he said that "Applying any more labor to any branch of agriculture would be the utmost folly." At the end he was enthusiastically advocating the introduction of new staples, such as "silk, indigo, grape, olive, more sugar and wool, madder and woad." All this could be done not "at the expense of any other production, but greatly to the relief of all, as all are overdone, and could well spare labor."[48] Ware wrote some illuminating passages on cotton culture. He suggested fixing prices at a rate which would increase demand tremendously and would at the same time make foreign competition impossible.[49]

[44] *Ibid.*, 28-34.
[45] *Ibid.*, 135. See, also, *ibid.*, 7.
[46] *Ibid.*, 134, 205.
[47] *Ibid.*, 78-79, 209.
[48] *Ibid.*, 35, 119, 297-304.
[49] *Ibid.*, 101-15.

An excellent example of Ware's efforts to direct all the resources of the nation towards the development of manufacturing and national self-sufficiency was his attitude toward the problem of slavery. Like the other nationalist economists, he understood—but passively and rather dispassionately—the moral issue involved. He saw the "horrors of slavery" and "its moral turpitude." "On all these points," he wrote, "there can be but one opinion, if the thing had to be gone over again."[50] But he also believed Negroes were racially inferior, and wore "the eternal mark of degradation . . . fixed, both by nature and fact." He was certain that freedom would make the Negro "infinitely more immoral and worthless," and that colonization was impossible. "Slavery, then, will remain among us, mix in with the population in the long run of circumstances, and is destined to form the stamina of population, particularly in the delta of the Mississippi river."[51]

But Ware saw that the institution was a part of the national economy and therefore demanded the attention of the economist. He saw that slavery was an economic disadvantage, and had squeezed free labor out of a large portion of the country. But he evidently believed it would ultimately become extinct—at the moment when it would no longer be profitable to the slaveowner, when population had become so dense that free labor would be as cleap as slave labor.[52] By what process this was to come about, he did not indicate. As to the time involved, Ware once suggested fifty years; at another time, a "century or two"; at still another, "ere long."[53]

Forced, then, upon the United States by "adamantine circumstances," slavery should be shunted into productive labors, should be metamorphosed from a clog on the market and a liability into a national resource and a source of labor. To what better use could the 400,000 slaves who could be easily removed from unprofitable agriculture in the border states be put than manufacturing? These slaves, Ware believed, could do the work as well as whites, and much more cheaply. Such work

[50] *Ibid.*, 200.
[51] *Ibid.*, 250, 228.
[52] *Ibid.*, 11, 173, 201, 203-204, 227-28.
[53] *Ibid.*, 101, 32, 106.

would be more humane to the slave, for he would be better off indoors in a warm building than "exposed half clad on the farms, amid swamps and rain." On the other hand, slave labor in factories would exempt "to that extent free people, and particularly delicate females and children, from factory drudgery and labor. . . . let us bestow upon them," Ware wrote, "the worst, most unhealthy and degrading sort of duties and labor, to the exemption of free persons. This would shock humanity no more than slavery does, and make freedom more dignified and valuable."[54]

In short, Ware made no effort really to alleviate the condition of the slave, or to solve the social and moral problem posed by the institution. On the contrary, he accepted it, with a wry face to be sure, and attempted merely to change it into "an efficient labor for the prosperity of the country."[55] Here Ware differed from most writers of the nationalist school. They were, by and large, active abolitionists; and those who advocated the placement of Negroes in factories did so on the basis of free Negroes. Mathew Carey, closest to Ware's point of view, believed slavery must inevitably remain, but at least thought colonization possible. But Ware's views are certainly more to be expected from a Southern planter and slaveowner.[56]

Another subject to which Ware directed his attention was population. By and large, he, like the nationalists in general, was unfavorable to the Malthuso-Ricardian doctrine, although his views on population were often similar to those of Malthus. Like Hamilton fifty years earlier, he recognized the importance of a "full and efficient population in all countries, for the defence, wealth, and refinement, that ought to accompany every government or association of the human family."[57] So essential was this in his political economy, that it was one of his main arguments

[54] *Ibid.*, 30-34.

[55] *Ibid.*, 204.

[56] It is worthy of note that Ware argued against expansion not only on grounds of population density but also because it would give slavery a new lease on life. *Ibid.*, 231, 227.

[57] *Ibid.*, 246. See Turner, *Ricardian Rent Theory;* Joseph J. Spengler, "Population Theory in the Ante-Bellum South," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), II (1936), 360; and *id.*, "Population Doctrines in the United States, I. Anti-Malthusianism," in *Journal of Political Economy* (Chicago, 1892-), XLI (1933), 433.

in opposing westward expansion.[58] Like Malthus, Ware believed "The natural check and limit to an increase of population is the capacity of the earth to support it and feed it. To this point it tends, and nothing in the end can prevent its reaching this maximum."[59] But Ware found all this no cause for pessimism. For his faith in the power of new agronomic methods and scientific progress was the solution to one factor, the ability of the earth to yield. And for the second factor, the birth rate, Ware pointed out the healthful effect of raising the standard of living. Like Raymond, Ware believed "pride" and style were wholesome checks on population.[60]

If Ware never offered a theory of rent or discussed it at length as Henry C. Carey did, there is one at least implicit in a passage of the *Notes on Political Economy;* and, if we may take the italicized words at their face value, it contains the kernel of what was, forty years later, to figure so prominently in Henry George's economic philosophy.

> Again, [wrote Ware,] *the advance of population* and wants in all countries, *make the lands valuable.* Whole quarters of cities and villages, and dense setttlements, grow upon the *lazy accidental landholders.* . . . I could number half a million of substantial farmers in the United States, East and West, who *became men of substance by the growth of the country around them,* lands rising from a quarter dollar an acre up to sixty, whilst they were in the mean time struggling with an overloaded market, and making nothing but a bare support on their farms.[61]

Like Hamilton and the nationalist school, Ware believed internal improvements were fundamental to the development of the nation and must be counted as part of its wealth. The public lands could be used to pay for these improvements, if they were not already being used to subsidize public education.[62]

[58] *Notes on Political Economy,* 227. See, also, *ibid.,* 90-91. It is significant that although Ware opposed expansion, he included the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Coast regions in his appraisal of America's resources, *ibid.,* 52; and considered Texas in discussing America's capacity for producing cotton, although he expressly warned against its acquisition, *ibid.,* 102.

[59] *Ibid.,* 247.

[60] *Ibid.,* 190-91, 247-49. Ware believed poor laws created pauperism and that "it would be to the interest of society to kill off" all "drones" and "excrescences" who depend on public charity. *Ibid.,* 194-99.

[61] *Ibid.,* 215. Italics are the writer's.

[62] *Ibid.,* 193-94, 255-56, 266-82.

He believed, again taking his cue from Hamilton, that the capitalist should be identified with the nation, partly through the medium of the national debt, partly through the ownership of labor resources and raw materials. Capital should be so arranged "as to make it the interest of the owners that the country should be steady, orderly, and undisturbed by changes of any sort. Capitalists then stand upon the watchtowers, the great policies of the nation, and guard its best and most substantial interests."[63] But whether the national debt is good or bad depends, he said, upon whether or not it is owned by the citizens of the nation in question and upon whether it is heavy enough to become a tax on labor. Under favorable conditions, he wrote, echoing Hamilton's very words, the debt is a blessing: "It cements and consolidates the fabric of a government, by making the most sordid concerned in its prosperity. . . . Such a debt comports with patriotism," and it should not be paid off, but rather kept as an encouragement to capital.[64]

Like Mathew Carey, Ware believed that capital and currency should be proportional to trade, and that an increase in the latter necessitated an increase in the former. Like Carey again, he declared currency must rest on a metallic basis and upon the credit of the government. It is noteworthy that Ware's attitude here, not emphatically in favor of a national bank, fitted into the 1844 Whig platform of a "well-regulated" currency.

That the orbit of Ware's political economy had its center in the nation is evident. He was a nationalist and centralist, and the entire volume reflects that attitude. Yet, as his prejudices and political ideology unfold, Ware's association with Southern Whig doctrine becomes ever more obvious. The Whig party owed its origin to a strange coalition of opponents to Jacksonian Democracy; nowhere was this more evident than in the South, where state rightists and National Republicans joined hands against the Democrats. But by the early forties, when Ware wrote, Southern Whiggery had been cleansed of its radical elements and its advocates were fairly united in subordinating sectionalism to the

[63] *Ibid.*, 139-40.
[64] *Ibid.*, 223-25.

cause of national party harmony.[65] By this time, too, the strength of the Southern Whigs lay in the slaveowning aristocracy. Ware's attitude toward democracy coincided with that of these ante-bellum "princes of privilege," and therein lies his only significant departure from the ideas of the national economists.

The nationalists, with few exceptions (as List), agreed with Ware in believing that the United States should be governed in the Federalist tradition. Ware was emphatic on this point. His criticism of the principles of Jeffersonian and Jacksonian Democracy, his firm belief that all prejudice and antiprotectionism flowed from "party-feeling," his charges of corruption against the Jackson, Van Buren, and Tyler administrations, his repeated condemnation of "state-right sticklers" and other special interests which exist at the expense of the nation, were certainly reflections of Clay dogma.[66] "The absurdities of our politics," Ware wrote, ". . . are more mysterious than the Egyptian Sphinx or the Delphian Oracle; and the motives that inclined our politicians to such things are entirely inexplicable on any principles that ordinarily govern men."[67] Ware suggested war as a cure for the troubles that were leading America to anarchy and ruin; that alone would "lift us above all this meanness and local feeling, and make and preserve us a nation." Wars in general, he believed, throw a people on its resources, sharpen its wits, and teach it real independence, and when "waged in a spirit of civilization," they are a necessary stimulus to all peoples, for "Nations, like individuals, require excitement."[68]

Education, too, attracted Ware's attention, and his discussion of it was colored by his economic attitude. He was emphatic in his advocacy of public, government supported and regulated education which, he believed, was "a national concern, a first duty, and the only true support any free institutions can have, upon which to depend with certainty." Pointing out that "A general suffrage without education is sure ruin to

[65] Phillips, "The Southern Whigs," in *loc. cit.,* 216; Cole, *Whig Party in the South,* Chap. III.

[66] See, for instance, *Notes on Political Economy,* 126, 218-19, 75-76, 226-27, 257, 158-61, 280, 24-25.

[67] *Ibid.,* 270-71.

[68] *Ibid.,* 216-20.

any government," he belittled the "sticklers for state rights" and the "anti-federal or democratic party" which denied to the government the power to legislate for education.[69] He suggested that the Lancastrian monitorial system be spread throughout the nation, even in night schools for workers.[70] He warned, too, that there must be "no distinction by separate classing of the poor and rich in the primary schools; the poor scholar, who is educated at the public charge, should not know it, nor the others with whom he studies, lest he be mortified and depressed, and become a butt or mark for the others."[71]

His concern for education was presumably for the purpose of building up an intelligent and responsible public opinion upon which every democracy is dependent.[72] But Ware was by no means democratic in his political philosophy. The Southern Whig-planter aristocracy of his day fought hard to maintain its privilege against what it believed to be the disorganizing and leveling tendencies of the Democrats on whom it looked with "mingled contempt and fear."[73] This was precisely Ware's attitude; and the opinions he incorporated in his chapter on "Representation, Public Opinion, Suffrage," smack of the Hamiltonian "The People is a beast." Only the "worth, and intelligence and substance of the land," he believed, stand forth as the champions of human rights. A suffrage not based on property qualifications becomes the tool of designing politicians. And there is soon produced in the rabble a feeling "against all the wealth, intelligence, and refinement in the country, which they are taught to brand as aristocrats and proud, and a total separation takes place very much to the injury to both."[74] Although the entire matter rests in a haze of confused thoughts, it is evident that Ware believed in government by the rich and intelligent, by those sufficiently wealthy and educated to have a personal interest in stability and strong central government.[75]

[69] *Ibid.*, 255, 259.
[70] *Ibid.*, 95, 155-56, 229, 261, 262.
[71] *Ibid.*, 261.
[72] *Ibid.*, 282-84.
[73] Cole, *Whig Party in the South,* 70, 73.
[74] *Notes on Political Economy,* 293-97. See, also, *ibid.*, 284-86.
[75] Lengthy quotations from *Notes on Political Economy* appear in Calvin Colton, *The*

The *Notes on Political Economy* was by no means so optimistic as the works of the other nationalist economists generally were. To be sure, it pictured the glorious possibilities of the United States and its future; but it contained, too, a reproach for opportunities missed, for errors made by the American government in its half-century of existence, and warnings of what might be expected under a Democratic regime. But in *An Exposition,* written only one year later, Ware's mood had changed entirely. Optimism is completely gone, even warnings are lacking; there is only recollection of what might have been had America acted wisely, dire forebodings of the anarchy, ruin, and distress that will visit America in the near future, and an analysis of the forces which make that future inevitable. The book is literally a lament. Ware was convinced of the debacle; he sincerely believed a new French Revolution was in the offing, when the American confederation would revert to its original entities and to anarchy. The change in mood was in all probability stimulated by the defeat suffered by Clay and the Whigs in the presidential election of the previous year. The entire volume seems to be the product of a soured and pessimistic man of substance, disappointed by what appeared to him the disappearance of all that was good in his political and social ideology and by the magnification of those forces which he believed would inevitably destroy him, his class, and the American Union.[76] A partial stimulus might also be found in the fact that the Old Natchez

Life and Times of Henry Clay, 2 vols. (New York, 1846), II, 273-88, 464, 478. "The great opposition to the protective policy," Colton wrote, ". . . has arisen from the southern planting interest. But Mr. Clay, 'a Southern Planter,' and many others, have proved conclusively, that this policy is equally important to the south as to the north." "That such a voice [as Ware's] should come forth from . . . [the South] was perhaps unexpected. It cannot be denied, that the teachings of this work—they are very strong—are worthy of special regard on account of this origin." Similar quotations and comments appear in *id., Public Economy for the United States* (New York, 1845), 490-92, 493, 535-36. One of the impressions left with the reader is that Ware is being identified with Southern Whiggery. Of much greater interest are the comments in Pickering, *Working Man's Political Economy.* Pickering, a free trader, abolitionist, and Democrat, claimed all books previous to his had been written by monarchists or monied aristocrats. He identified Ware as one of the latter. He was definitely associated with the rich capitalists who exploited the poor. Pickering went so far as to suggest the title for a new work on economics: "Political Economy: Devoted to the interests of the King, and the Capitalist: . . . By Malthus, Colquhoun, Smith, Say, Blake, Ware, and Many Others." See *ibid.,* 34, 35-36, 38, 67.

[76] "Never again," Ware lamented, "will we have a Whig or an honest administration!" The Whigs, under Clay, had made their last effort. "They now give up the ship and await the catastrophe that impends over the country." *An Exposition,* 69, 70-71.

Region, which was the center of the aristocracy and Whiggery of Mississippi, and with which we may be justified in associating Ware, lost more and more of its influence in state affairs in the course of the forties. And with the passing of the years, the Whigs gradually were "metamorphosed from a political party into a social class, and the word 'Whig' came to denote little more than an aristocratic way of life."[77]

There is no significant change in Ware's ideas or opinions accompanying this change of mood. His attitude toward abstractions and theorizing, his views on manufacturing and protective tariffs, on internal improvements, on banking and currency, on education, on the mails, on the poor, on expansionism, on state rights, are substantially the same, though dealt with in less detail than in the *Notes*.[78]

The bulk of the text is devoted to an expansion and analysis of Ware's assertions that "the Government of the United States of North America is extremely defective, and carries in its bosom the seeds of its own destruction," and that "the greatest defect in the structure of this government, and the most sure to operate her ruin, is her Federative form."[79] Ware claimed no confederation had ever succeeded, and he went into great detail to show how local loyalties and state rights had succeeded in undermining the American Union, with the result that the Constitution had become utterly worthless. All this was, to a large extent, the result of the "damnable policy of Thomas Jefferson and his party," and of Andrew Jackson, who "combined most curiously and most fatally a despotism and a demagogue spirit, that did every thing under names that had become dear to the people, such as Democracy and Jeffersonian principles."[80]

Ware rang in all their changes and almost *ad nauseam* his accusations of the "dangerous statesman" Jefferson, of state righters, and of those who believed in democracy. He was still convinced that the general suffrage was one of the fatal causes of disunion.[81] He strenuously attacked

[77] Sydnor, *Benjamin L. C. Wailes,* 290-91.

[78] *An Exposition,* 213-15, 335-36, 31-38, 357-61, 151-60, 368-70, 262-72, 352-56, 215-20, 370-73, 189-92, 373-75, 25-28, 128-43.

[79] *Ibid.,* 11.

[80] *Ibid.,* 258, 260. See, also, 234-62, 45-46, 50, 86.

[81] *Ibid.,* 38-71, 325-29.

the immigration policy which gave citizenship to those who had no feelings of citizenship and which brought disruptive elements to America.[82] He inveighed especially against the Irish for their corruption, stupidity, and radicalism.[83] He wrote violently against party spirit and corruption in government.[84] He declared there was no assurance in America for the protection of life and property.[85] Although he wanted a dense population, he realized that the effects of popular suffrage were most severe in the cities, where population was most concentrated, where immigrants were plentiful, and where people were the poorest.[86]

Ware expressed himself much more emphatically against slavery in *An Exposition* than he did in the *Notes.* The reason for the change lay at least partly in his conviction that slavery "unquestionably turned the scale in the last Presidential election, and ensured the triumph of democracy."[87] More significant than Ware's woeful picture of the sad lot of both slave and free Negro,[88] was his description of the debilitating influence of slavery upon slaveowners and the Southern states. Himself a slaveowner, Ware wrote:

> The morals . . . of the slave States must, in the very nature of the case, be comparatively bad, must be reckless, arrogating, presuming, unamiable, and dissipated, and the high moral tone and pride they assume, do not compensate for the want of purity in their character, the want of amiableness in their manners, the want of regularity in their habits, and a just punctuality in their dealings. . . . Their acts are often generous, but their generosity is impulsive; and the patronage they lend to the arts, either vouchsafed or flows from pride rather than any love of the more refined sciences.[89]

Abolitionism Ware likened to the European Crusades. It would, he felt, inevitably absorb all the parties in the North, for as its influence increased, parties would see that victory could be won only by alliances with it. "Then a new era will dawn, and this geographical line between the free and the slave States, be marked in blood." Thus abolitionism,

[82] *Ibid.*, 39-41, for example.
[83] *Ibid.*, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 66, 80-81, 255.
[84] *Ibid.*, 72-90.
[85] *Ibid.*, 285-301.
[86] *Ibid.*, 325-27.
[87] *Ibid.*, 177.
[88] *Ibid.*, 66, 167-85, 331-33.
[89] *Ibid.*, 168-69, 171-73.

irresistible, would be the means, not of freeing the slaves, but of destroying the Union. For Ware was still convinced that to free the slaves would do more harm than good, and that slavery would remain in America until white labor should be cheap enough to replace it.[90]

Nothing but Ware's own words can do justice to his description of the impending crisis.

When the great cauldron [of democracy] boils and casts up its scum and froth, it will roll over the bounds assigned to it, and overwhelm in its turmoil all in its way, not only those intended to be the victims [the rich], but those who reared it up and vainly hoped to lead or control it [the Democratic party]. As happened in the French Revolution, the tools and minions of the designing politicians will rise above and first set their foot on the necks of their leaders, and those who taught them the scent of blood, and to desecrate religion and private property. The tide that rolls on bears down all. The dregs of the poisoned chalice has to be drunk by the persons who mixed it for their betters. The anarchy that follows such an outbreak throws up, to prominent and conspicuous action, some strong energy, that seizes the monster entangled in its own toils, and establishes a despotism as the only thing that can cure the disorders of society. Thus ends the chapter of the general suffrage! Thus will end the Union! Thus will disperse to its original elements the confederation! Say not that this picture is hypothetical and conjured up by the imagination! It is the truth of history, the embodiment of the past, the denoument of poor human nature's drama.[91]

Thus will vanish the world's "great experiment in Liberty,"[92] and "we shall be the mockery of nations, the unworthy guardians of liberty, and traitors to her holy cause."[93]

The following passage provides the best summation of Ware's ideal political society:

My government should be a Republic—the Legislature Representative—the Executive for not less than a ten years term, and then not re-eligible—my Judges for life, and independent—my Electors should have a real estate property qualification—my salaries should be liberal—my punishments certain and severe enough to deter vice—my public virtues should all be rewarded by proper monuments and notices—my public servants, when growing old, be pensioned—my education be a National concern, and embracing all—my Religions all tolerated, and left to voluntary support—my National defences ample, without being too expensive—my Revenues from imposts as far as possible—my Manufacturing in-

[90] *Ibid.*, 281, 283, 284, 184-85.
[91] *Ibid.*, 64.
[92] *Ibid.*, 9-10, 90.
[93] *Ibid.*, 123.

dustry protected, up to national supply at least.—No slavery—no poor laws, beyond infirmiries. One National bank to aid the revenues, and a National repository.—All the internal improvements possible. I would patronize the Arts —all mechanical inventions be rewarded, and secured to the inventors.—Museums of Natural history, of agricultural improvements, and such branches as are useful, be got up and kept for inspection.—My intercourse with other nations honorable and courteous.—My naturalization laws insure that foreigners had become citizens in feeling, before they enjoyed the privileges of citizens.—My Territories should not exceed six to eight hundred miles square, nor embrace more than eight or ten degrees of latitude.—I will have as little constitution as possible, or the rules and dictations of such an instrument, and no confederation—no trial by jury.[94]

Of all the nationalists, Ware stood closest to Mathew Carey. In several particulars only did they differ. Carey believed colonization possible; Ware did not. Carey had a deep, humanitarian sympathy for the poor and believed relief imperative upon the wealthy; Ware treated the masses like so many ergs of industrial energy. Neither Carey nor the other nationalists, with the exception of their father, Hamilton, believed it necessary to abstract the *demos* from democracy, as Ware did. Carey was fundamentally enthusiastic and saw a splendid future for America. Ware, too, saw possibilities; but, soured by the sixteen years from Jackson through Tyler, and curdled by the election of Polk, his optimism turned to gloom. Carey's economics was hardly more than a set of variations of Hamilton's Report on Manufactures.[95] And the same is largely true of Ware's.

Ware's membership in the nationalist school is unmistakable. But he must also be identified with Southern Whiggery. His opinions and attitudes were fundamentally the same as those of the slaveowning aristocracy of which he was a member. But he differed from his fellow Southern aristocrats occasionally. They probably would not have accepted his ideas on population and expansion. They certainly would not have subscribed to his philippic against slavery, and it is not difficult to understand why he did not sign his name to the tirade against the slaveowner included in *An Exposition,* although his conclusions on slavery itself were often accepted in the South by his class.

[94] *Ibid.,* 336-37.
[95] Rowe, *Mathew Carey,* 114.

Notes and Documents

The Montgomery Address of Stephen A. Douglas

Edited by David R. Barbee and Milledge L. Bonham, Jr.

One of Douglas's biographers has pointed out that, although the Illinois Democrat soon realized the hopelessness of his campaign of 1860, "he knew he was the head of the true party of Jefferson, he felt that the old Union would not stand if he was beaten. He was the leader of a forlorn hope, but he led it superbly well. He undertook a canvass of the country the like of which no candidate had ever made before."[1] Others have shown that Douglas was well aware of the danger he ran in speaking in the South, but was not thereby deterred from invading the slave states and asserting therein that Lincoln's election would not justify secession. Nor did the knowledge of this danger prevent his speaking at several places in the home state of the Apostle of Secession, William Lowndes Yancey.[2] As early as October 8, when he learned that Indiana and Pennsylvania had gone Republican, Douglas was convinced that Lincoln would be elected. It was then that he decided to go South and make a last effort to save the Union.[3] The speech subjoined, delivered from the steps of the state capitol at Montgomery, Alabama, on the afternoon of November 2, 1860, was one of the final gestures in that patriotic but futile effort. On the preceding evening, while Douglas was being escorted to his hotel by a torchlight procession, some of the disaffected in the community hurled two mature eggs and some tomatoes at

[1] William G. Brown, *Stephen Arnold Douglas* (Boston, 1902), 135.

[2] George F. Milton, *The Eve of Conflict, Stephen A. Douglas and the Needless War* (Boston, 1934), 497-99; Allen Johnson, *Stephen A. Douglas* (New York, 1908), 438; Henry P. Willis, *Stephen A. Douglas* (Philadelphia, 1910), 322.

[3] Milton, *The Eve of Conflict*, 499.

him. Fortunately, they missed their target and struck some of the local reception committee.[4]

Though some of the Douglas biographers have been aware of this speech, none, so far as the editors know, has quoted it; nor does it appear in any collection of the addresses of Douglas. The reason is not far to seek. It was delivered only four days before the momentous election of 1860, and probably appeared only in the Montgomery papers. By the time these reached most of their exchanges, the election was over, and percipient editors realized that its arguments would fall on deaf ears.

As will appear from parenthetical insertions, the audience applauded the oratory of Douglas—but they did not vote for him.[5] Today the reader may find the speech very convincing; at least, it is an excellent summary of the Douglas view of the slavery question as it related to the territories, particularly of the doctrine of nonintervention. One wonders why it did not have more effect upon those who heard it. There are numerous explanations possible, each of which, probably, was only a factor. For one thing, popular sovereignty, as interpreted by Douglas, had been repudiated by the great majority of Southern Democrats by 1860. For another, the Rhetts and Yanceys and Toombses were too shrewd to relax their efforts even at the eleventh hour. Douglas spoke at midday. The same evening Yancey replied.[6] Another probable factor is that many of Douglas's auditors who attended closely and applauded loudly were swayed merely by the emotion of the moment, by mass psychology; but in their calmer moments they did not trust Douglas. While to posterity he seems to have been sincerely devoted to his avowed

[4] Henry Wilson, *History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America,* 3 vols. (Boston, 1876-1878), II, 700.

[5] The same issue of the Montgomery *Confederation,* November 9, 1860, which carried Douglas's speech gave early election returns from several states, indicating that Lincoln had been elected. It also carried the results of the election in Montgomery and in Montgomery County. At the Courthouse Breckinridge received 361, Bell, 280, and Douglas, 49; Exchange: Breckinridge, 457, Bell, 297, and Douglas, 63; Harrogate Springs: Breckinridge, 37, Bell, 11, and Douglas, 3; Rives: Breckinridge, 37, Bell, 10, and Douglas, 0. In the state of Alabama, Breckinridge received 48,831, Bell, 27,875, and Douglas, 13,651. Edward Stanwood, *A History of the Presidency,* 2 vols. (Boston, 1924), I, 297.

[6] J. W. DuBose, *Life and Times of William Lowndes Yancey* (Birmingham, 1892), 534-35.

principle of "popular sovereignty," to many of his contemporaries it seemed but the opportunist expedient of a very clever demagogue.

One of the leaders of the Union element of Alabama was J. J. Seibels, founder and editor of the Montgomery *Confederation,* daily and weekly, published by Edwin A. Banks and George W. Dickey. Doubtless the speech quoted below appeared in the daily issue for November 3. Certainly it appeared in the weekly for November 9. All files of the daily have disappeared except those for 1859 and the first half of 1860, which are now in the Library of Congress. But in the office of the Montgomery *Advertiser* are preserved some files of the weekly *Confederation.* While seeking for information about John Wilkes Booth's sojourn in Montgomery in the autumn of 1860, an assistant of Mr. Barbee's found this speech and drew it to his attention. It is a startling reflection that perhaps both Booth and Yancy were in Douglas's audience that day. With what varied emotions they must have listened!

JUDGE DOUGLAS said: Fellow citizens of Alabama, I sincerely trust that the bright and genial sun which has succeeded the dark and stormy night through which we have just passed, may be auspicious of a brilliant and happy future for our common country.—[Cheers.] The Republic is now involved in darkness, and surrounded with those elements of discord which inspire the patriot[']s hearts with dread. I sincerely cherish the hope that the light of reason and patriotism will enter the hearts of our countrymen, and guide their action in such direction as will save the Republic from this threatened disaster. I believe that if we are faithful to the Constitution, as our fathers made it, there is no grievance of which any portion of our people complain, but what can be remedied under the Constitution and within the Union. ["That's true," "that's the doctrine," and cheers.] I regard this Union as the greatest blessing ever conferred upon a free people. I know but one mode by which this Union can be preserved, and that is by maintaining inviolate every provision of the Constitution. [Cheers.] Every right secured by that instrument, every obligation imposed by it must be protected and performed in good faith. ["That's it" and cheers.]

The abolitionists of the North profess a willingness to abide by and carry out all the provisions of the Constitution with one or two exceptions. When I took the oath of fidelity to the Constitution of the United States, I found no exceptions in the oath. ["That's right," "Bully for you" and cheers.] Every man who holds office under the Federal Government, or under a State Government, takes an oath to support the Constitution without any exceptions, and yet the

Abolitionists, or the Republicans as they choose to call themselves, tell us that their consciences will not permit them to obey these clauses of the Constitution, which provide for the surrender of fugitive slaves. I never yet knew an Abolitionist so conscientious that he would not accept office under the government. [Laughter and applause.] I never knew one so conscientious that he would not take an oath of fidelity to the Constitution, in all of its parts, in order to get possession of his office. [Laughter.] I want no man to represent me or to administer power over me who will take an oath of fidelity to the Constitution in order to get possession of his office, with a mental reservation that when in office he will violate both the Constitution and his oath. ["That's true," "Hurrah for Douglas" and cheers.] I hold that when any man becomes so conscientious that he cannot obey the Constitution of his country in all of its parts, he ought to be too honest and too conscientious to receive protection under it. The Constitution as our fathers made it is good enough for me. Every duty imposed by it, every obligation to be enforced under it, I am prepared to perform in good faith. Let this be done and there will be no cause for strife or ill feeling between the different portions of this Union.

The only question which now disturbs our harmony and generates hostility, is that of African slavery. [Cheers.] This question existed when the government was made; but there was peace in it for the first thirty years after the Constitution was established. Let us inquire upon what principle the government was framed and was administered during the time there was peace on this question, with a view of ascertaining whether if we return to the same policy we can enjoy the same blessings. When this government was made, it was composed of free and slaveholding States. Some few of the slaveholding States had taken initiatory steps to become free States. The doctrine did not prevail at that day which is now proclaimed by Mr. Lincoln and his abolition allies, that these States must all be free or all be slave, in order to maintain the Union. Our fathers had too much sense to entertain any such doctrines. The framers of our Constitution knew that in a country as broad as this, with such a variety of soil, climate and productions, there must necessarily be a corresponding variety of interests requiring different laws and different institutions, adapted to the wants and interests of each locality. They knew that the laws and institutions which would suit the granite hills of New England, would be unsuited to the rice, cotton and sugar plantations of the South. Hence our system of government rests on the basis that the Federal Government must exercise only such powers as are national and relate to the whole country without interfering with the domestic affairs of the people. It was supposed at that day that each State had interests different from every other one, and accordingly would require different legislation and institutions. The Federal Constitution was made on this theory. So far as the question of slavery was concerned, it received careful consideration in the convention and was placed upon a basis that every man

thought could never be disturbed by federal power. Remember that at that period the Constitution was made there was a strong abolition feeling, even in Virginia. Gov. [George] Mason in the Convention made speeches on the subject of slavery more radical, revolutionary, dangerous, and offensive than any that were ever made by Seward, or Lincoln, or Sumner. The anti-slavery party of that day demanded that the Convention should insert a clause in the Constitution, prohibiting the African slave trade as immoral and unchristian. The representatives of Georgia and South Carolina who were more interested in slavery than the representatives of any other State, at once told the Convention that if they inserted a clause in the Constitution which placed an institution of their States under the ban morally and religiously, they would never enter the Union. They brought the Convention to a dead stand, and forced the anti-slavery sentiment to yield. The consequence was, the adoption of the provisions of the Constitution, by which each could, if it choose [*sic*] engage in the slave trade up to the year 1808, but after that Congress might prohibit it. That provision waived the moral and religious objection. That provision recognised slavery as legitimate commerce or traffic, and made its perpetuation or abolition a question of expediency, and not of moral. On that basis the African slave trade was adjusted.

The agitation of the question, however, alarmed the Southern Representatives, who feared that in the process of time the abolitionists of the North should obtain possession of the Government, they might divest the title of slave property by federal law. Hence, Southern men would not consent that the title to their slaves should be dependent upon any federal power. And they demanded the insertion of a clause in the Federal Constitution recognizing their right of property in their slaves as existing not under the Constitution of the United States—not under the laws of Congress—not under federal authority; but as existing in each State under the laws *thereof*. [Cheers.] Read the clause in the Constitution as it now stands upon the subject of fugitive slaves, and you will see how cautiously the framers of the Government guarded slave property from federal interference. I will quote the clause: "No person held to service or labor in one State under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall be released by any law or regulation therein, but shall be delivered up." A slave is a person held to service, or labor in one State under the laws thereof. Not under the laws of Congress—not under the Constitution of the United States—not under federal authority; *but in a State under the laws thereof*—beyond the reach of Congress—beyond the touch of federal power, where abolitionism cannot interfere with it.—[Cheers.] Hence your title to your slave property is expressly recognized by the Federal Constitution as existing under your own laws, where no power on earth but yourselves can interfere with it. Such are the provisions of the Constitution, so far as they relate to the State.

Now let us inquire how it stands with the Territories. In the absence of

any express provisions on the subject with reference to the Territories, the fair inference would be that the same principles which applied to the States also applied to the Territories. ['Right.'] Such was the construction placed upon the Constitution by its founders. The first act of Congress in relation to slavery was passed in 1793, and it was known as the original fugitive slave law, approved by Washington, when Jefferson and [Edmund] Randolph were in his cabinet, and Madison was the leading man in Congress. Read the first section of the fugitive slave act of 1793, and you will find that it declares that any person held to service or labor in either of the States of this Union, or in any organized Territory, *under the laws thereof*, escaping, shall be delivered up. Thus you find that by that act slaves were to be held in the Territories the same as in the States, under the laws thereof, beyond the reach of Congress to interfere. That fugitive slave law still stands on the statute books, and it has been adjudged to be Constitutional and valid by the Supreme Court of the United States in two decisions, if not more. As the law now stands, therefore, slaves are to be held in the Territories the same as in the States, "under the laws thereof." [Cheers.] The Federal Government was administered on that policy up to 1820, when the memorable Missouri controversy arose. Up to that time Congress had never attempted to interfere with slavery either in the States or in the Territories. During that period many new States were admitted into the Union, and many Territories were organized by Congress. The Territories thus organized were not only those on the West side of the Mississippi, acquired from France; but included Mississippi and Alabama. Look into the act of Congress organizing the territory of Alabama, and you will find no provision prohibiting slavery on the one hand, or establishing it on the other. ["That's so," "That's true," and cheers.] Examine every one of those Territorial acts, from the adoption of the federal Constitution down to 1820, and you will find no attempt in any of them, either to maintain and protect slavery, or to abolish and prohibit it. Congress then acted on the true principle of the Constitution in organizing Territorial governments, and left the people free to have slavery just as long as they wanted it, and to get rid of it when they got tired of it. [Cheers.] So long as Congress acted on that principle of non-intervention on the subject of slavery there was peace between the North and the South, and harmony between the free and the slave States; but the first time that it attempted to touch the question anywhere with the view of controling it a sectional strife arose which came very near dissolving this glorious Union.

You all remember the great controversy of 1820 on the Missouri question. That controversy originated in the attempt of Congress to interfere with the question first in the State of Missouri, and secondly in the Territory of Arkansas. The doctrine of Congressional interference with slavery had its origin in the Hartford Convention, which was held during the last war[7] by the old blue light

[7] Douglas evidently meant "the last war with England," as the Mexican War, as well as the Seminole and Black Hawk wars were subsequent to the War of 1812.

federalists. ("That's so," "hit them again," laughter and cheers.)—By their treason to the country the federalists had rendered their party so odious that it was necessary to seize upon some new element of agitation to revive their broken and sinking fortunes. (Cheers.) They accordingly originated the scheme of thrusting the slavery question into Congress, claiming Congressional power over the subject, and then insisting that there should be no more slave States brought into the Union. The first opportunity they had of carrying out this federal scheme arose in 1820, when Missouri applied for admission as a State and Arkansas for organization as a Territory. Rufus King, the chief of the old federal party, proposed to put a restriction on the State of Missouri, keeping her out of the Union until she changed her constitution and abolished slavery. He also proposed to prohibit slavery in the Territory of Arkansas and the balance of our territories forever.[8] The Southern men, senators and representatives, without distinction of party, denounced the proposition as an usurpation of power on the part of the Federal Government not delegated in the Constitution. (Cheers.) Read the report of the great Lowndes, or the speeches of Henry Clay, Pinckney,[9] McLean[10] or the other great men who lead [*sic*] the Southern forces in that contest, and you will find that they deny the power of the Federal Government over the subject. They did not, at that day, pretend that Congress had the power to protect, but they only insisted that it had no power to prohibit. ("Hear, hear," and cheers.) This distinction, giving the power to protect and not to prohibit, is of later origin. (Laughter and cheers.) It required greater men, brighter intellects, more profound statesmen than Lowndes, Clay, Pinckney or McLean, or than Washington, Jefferson and Madison, who had preceded them, to make that refined distinction. (Laughter and cheers.)

Southern men stood together as an unit, denying the power of Congress over

[8] As is well known, James Tallmadge of New York, supported by J. W. Taylor of the same state, took the initiative on February 13, 1819, in the House of Representatives in seeking to exclude slavery from Missouri. But Rufus King's speech in the Senate supporting this view was widely circulated as an Abolition campaign document. As early as 1785, in the Continental Congress, King sought to exclude slavery from the territories. See *Journals of the Continental Congress,* 34 vols. (Washington, 1904-1937), XXVIII, 164 (March 16, 1785); Charles R. King, *Life and Correspondence of Rufus King,* 6 vols. (New York, 1894-1900), I, 39-40; VI, 217 ff.; Andrew C. McLaughlin, *The Confederation and the Constitution, 1783-1789* (New York, 1905), 117, 125; Frederick J. Turner, *The Rise of the New West, 1819-1829* (New York, 1906), 155-58. It is interesting to note how carefully Douglas ignored the antislavery provision in the Northwest Ordinance.

[9] Douglas may have alluded to Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, who made a speech opposing the Missouri Compromise, but it is more likely that he had in mind William Pinkney, member of the Senate from Maryland, who "became the champion of the slaveholding states" in the controversy. J. Harold Easterby, "Charles Pinckney," in *Dictionary of American Biography,* 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), XIV, 613; John J. Dolan, "William Pinkney," *ibid.,* 628.

[10] It is quite likely that Douglas alluded to Louis McLane of Delaware. Alney McLean of Kentucky did not participate in the debate on the Missouri question.

the subject of slavery. ("That's so.") The South demanded non-intervention, hands off, (cheers,) let the subject alone, let the people do as they please, so [long] as they do not violate the Constitution, and let the courts annul the territorial legislation when unconstitutional. (Tremendous applause.) That was the principle upon which the South stood in 1820, sustained by a few Northern men who had gallantry enough and devotion to principle sufficient to defy the fanaticism of their own section and to risk everything in the support of truth, justice and equality. ("Hurrah for Douglas," and cheers.) The fight was a fearful one, and brought this country to the very verge of dissolution. Unfortunately, in an evil hour, governed by patriotic motives, that overweighed a strict regard for fundamental principles, the South yielded the point and consented to a compromise. I blame no man who went for the Missouri Compromise. It was made by a band of as pure patriots as ever lived, and it had its origin in a love for the Union and a desire to live together in peace forever. In order to get Missouri into the Union, the South consented to the prohibition of slavery in all the Territory of the U. S. North of 36 deg. 30 min. That proposition did not suit the Northern abolitionists of that day any more than it has those who have followed them.

When I entered Congress, in 1843, I found the Missouri Compromise on the statute book, and the conservative men of all parties acquiescing in it. I could not reconcile it with sound principles, but still it was there. It had been received by the country as a peace offering; it had been acquiesced in for nearly twenty-five years; the North and the South stood by it as a unit; the Northern Whigs and Northern Democrats were supporting it, and nobody was fighting it but the Abolitionists. Such was the condition of things when the question of the annexation of Texas was introduced into Congress. I being one of its earliest and warmest advocates, proposed when the question of slavery arose in connection with it to disturb our harmony, to settle it by the extension of the Missouri Compromise line to the Western border of Texas, in the same sense with which it was originally adopted. The South agreed to it, and a few men of the North went with me in its support. By these few votes, with a united South, we carried it and added Texas to the Union. (Cheers.)[11]

In 1848, after we had acquired California and New Mexico, the question arose as to the kind of government we should give them.—Being Chairman of the Committee on Territories in the Senate, it became my duty to report the bill, which I did in August 1848, inserting in it, as the record will show, a provision extending the Missouri line to the Pacific Ocean, in the same sense and with the same understanding with which it was originally adopted in 1820. That proposition passed the Senate by twelve majority, receiving the support of every Southern man of every party, John C. Calhoun included. When it was sent down to

[11] Douglas seems to claim more than his share of credit. Cf. Justin H. Smith, *The Annexation of Texas* (New York, 1911), 327-28, 467.

the House of Representatives for concurrence, it was defeated by Northern votes with freesoil proclivities. [Laughter.] Its defeat produced all the sectional strife which existed from 1848 to 1850, and which again threatened the existence of the Union. If the Missouri line had been adhered to and extended to the Pacific Ocean, there would have been an end to the controversy forever, so far as the territories were concerned; but unfortunately the conservative men, the union-loving men of the country were unable to carry it out. The South planted itself upon the Missouri line as a *sine qua non.* The Nashville convention, which I think assembled in 1849 or '50, to prescribe the ultimatum on which the South would remain in the Union, tendered the Missouri line to the Pacific Ocean, as I had previously offered it as a settlement which would be satisfactory to the South. [Cheers.] Being unable to get that line so extended, the Abolitionists demanding that slavery should be prohibited everywhere, south as well as north of 36 deg. 30 min., the question then arose, "is there no other plan, is there no common ground upon which we can adjust this question upon the basis of equality and constitutional right." The strife which ensued alarmed the purest and best patriots in the land, for the fate of the Republic. Even the great Clay, who had performed his mission on earth, and retired to the shades of Ashland, to prepare for another and a better world, in his retirement heard the harsh and discordant notes of disunion and sectional strifes, and came forward from his retirement and resumed his seat in the Senate, that great theatre of his great deeds, to see if he could not by his wisdom, his experience, and the renown of his great name, do something to restore peace to a distracted country. [Hurrah for Clay" and cheers.) From the moment that Clay appeared among us, he became the leader of the Union Whigs and the Union Democrats, without regard to party distinction, against northern and southern agitators. For many months we assembled every morning in the Council Chamber, Clay in the Chair and Cass upon his right and Webster upon his left, devising means by which we could put down Northern abolitionism and Southern disunionism, and restore peace. The result of these deliberations was the Compromise Measures of 1850. We had been anxious to extend the Missouri line to the Pacific, but unable to do it. We had not the power, we could not get enough votes, and hence we had to devise a new plan. What was that new plan? It was that slavery was to be banished from the halls of Congress, and recommended to each State and each Territory to do as it pleased, and if any State or any Territory passed any law violating the rights of any citizen, he could appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, whose decision was to be final and conclusive. In other words, the Compromise Measures of 1850 were based on the great principle of non-intervention by Congress with the subject of slavery. Those measures brought the Federal Government back to the days of the Constitution, when there was peace and harmony in the country.

From this brief review you will see that the Constitution was made and the government organized on the principle of non-interference by Congress with

the question of slavery either in the States or in the Territories; that that principle was maintained in good faith down to 1820, when it was abandoned for the principle of intervention, which lasted until 1850, when it was abandoned and non intervention re-established according to the original doctrines of the Constitution. The intervention which prevailed from 1820 up to 1850 was the intervention of the Abolitionists against the South, but there was no intervention on the other side. [Cheers.] From 1850 down to this day the national men of all political parties have been pledged to non-intervention. When those measures were adopted there was an attempt made North and South to resist them. Recall to your minds for a moment the scenes which occurred immediately after they passed. When I went home that year, a cripple upon crutches from a surgical operation, I found the Northern people in a wild frenzy of fanaticism. Seward, Sumner, Chase, Giddings and the Abolition leaders were appealing to the Northern people and inflaming their passions upon the ground that by the compromise measures of 1850 we had betrayed Northern honor, Northern rights and Northern equality into the hands of the slave power. At Chicago, where I resided, the excitement was intense. Your chairman, in introducing me, referred to what occurred there. The city council passed resolutions officially denouncing me as a traitor, a Benedict Arnold, a Judas Iscariot, denounced the fugitive slave law as a violation of the Constitution and the law of God; instructed the police not to aid in executing it, and raised the standard of rebellion against federal authority. An Abolition meeting assembled for the purpose of carrying out these revolutionary proceedings, and they sent an invitation to me to come and address them. They first took possession of the hall and surrounded the stand with a body of free negroes and fugitive slaves armed with pistols and bowie knives, so that my friends could not gain admission, and then invited me to come. ["Hurrah for Douglas," and cheers.] I confess it was an entertainment which I did not care about participating in. [Laughter.] I went, not because I wanted to go, but because I thought it was most prudent to go. [Cheers.] I knew that if I did not go and meet the mob that it would come and find me. [Great laughter and cheers.] I was advised to leave the city, but I preferred any fate rather than do that. ["Good," and loud applause.] I went to their meeting, appeared on the stand and held them for four hours, surrounded by these colored gentlemen. [Laughter.] The first converts I made were the negroes, [loud laughter and applause,] and when I got possession of them I turned to the Abolitionists and said to them, I am now able to give you a practical illustration of your own doctrine, [cheers,] you raise a mob, and I take possession of it. [Cheers.] Luckily, the meeting listened to me while I vindicated *seriatem* [*sic*] every word and line in the fugitive slave law; demonstrated that it was their duty as honest men to support and execute it, and vindicated the compromise measures in full in all their parts. Before the meeting adjourned, resolutions were passed approving the fugitive slave law, [loud cheers,] and the next night the city council assembled in obedience to public opinion and re-

scinded their nullifying resolutions and declared that the law must be executed. [Cheers.] For weeks, each day, I addressed other meetings which were just as violent and just as fanatical.—Sometimes I would get them and sometimes they would get me. [A voice—"They didn't get you often," laughter and applause.] By a firm adherence to truth, to principle and to constitutional guaranties [*sic*] we brought the Northern people back to a sense of their duty, and for a time there was peace in the land.[12]

Now let me inquire what was being done in the South while we were fighting that battle in the North? In Mississippi you had Col. Davis on the stump denouncing the compromise measures as a surrender of Southern rights, Southern equality and Southern honor to Northern Abolitionists, and you had other leaders, extremists, in Alabama, Georgia and South Carolina, doing the same thing. But the Southern people could not be led off by appeals to their passions. In every Southern State the people resolved that they would maintain the principles on which the adjustment had been made. From that time your fire-eaters submitted to the doctrine of non-intervention, not because Congress had affirmed it, not because they liked it, but because the people of Alabama told them to submit, [tremendous applause,] and the people of each of the other Southern States told their politicians to submit. They then all became advocates of the doctrine of non-intervention. [Laughter.] The Northern Abolitionists being routed in one section and the Southern fire eaters in the other, they proposed a truce and treaty of peace. These Southern hotspurs became the most humble and polite gentlemen you ever saw. [Laughter and cheers.] They begged admission back into the Democratic party, [laughter,] and when we assembled at Baltimore in 1852 and nominated Gen. Pierce for President, we received them back on condition that they would abandon their opposition to non-intervention and thereafter vote with us in support of that principle. The National Democratic Convention in 1852, at Baltimore, affirmed the doctrine of non-intervention as it had been established by the compromise measures of 1850. No man will deny these facts.

Alabama voted for it in that convention and ratified the platform soon after, by voting for Pierce. ("That's so.") When the Whig party assembled in Convention in Baltimore in 1852, and nominated Gen. Scott for president, it affirmed the compromise measures of 1850, in substance and in principle is [*sic*] the language. That plank in the Whig platform was written by Daniel Webster at the table of Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, and was adopted by the Whig Convention at Baltimore.

[12] For the Chicago incident, cf. Brown, *Stephen Arnold Douglas,* 76-77; Milton, *The Eve of Conflict,* 81-82; James M. Sheahan, *The Life of Stephen A. Douglas* (New York, 1860), 168 *et seq.* This speech of October 23, 1850, was written out by Douglas next day and was printed in the appendix to [M. H. Flint], *Life of Stephen A. Douglas with His Most Important Speeches and Reports by a Member of the Western Bar* (New York, 1861). It was also issued as a pamphlet by Gideon of Washington in 1851.

Thus only eight years ago every Democrat and every Whig in the land stood pledged by the platform of his party, to carry out in good faith the doctrine of non-intervention by Congress with the question of slavery.

In 1854 it became my duty, still acting as the Chairman of the Committee on Territories, to report a bill to organize the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska. The old geographical line having been abandoned, and the doctrine of non-intervention substituted, which the Whigs and Democrats had both affirmed in the national Conventions, and which nobody opposed but the Abolitionists, I framed the bill on that principle. ("Good" and applause.) In order to give non-intervention and popular sovereignty fair play, and do equal and exact justice to the South as well as to the North, I incorporated[18] into the bill a provision repealing the Missouri restriction. (Cheers.) I did this for the reason that we had not been able to carry out the Missouri compromise in good faith. I was unwilling, as a Northern man, to allow it to stand on the statute book where we would claim its advantages without submitting to its disadvantages. When our Northern people refused to sustain me in extending the Missouri line to the Pacific ocean, which good faith required us to do, I told them I would take it off the statute book and place the South on an equality with the North. (Cheers.) I assume all the responsibility that attaches to the blotting out of that black line across the continent. ("We will sustain you in it," and cheers.) Then it was that the Abolitionists howled. They, for the first time, discovered that the Missouri Compromise was a great covenant, [laughter,] a compact binding in honor which no honest man could disregard. The same men who thus characterized it as sacred, were the men who in 1848 had prevented our carrying it out in good faith; who had denounced me for being its advocate, and who had denounced the Missouri Compromise as being the most infamous measure on earth. The moment it was taken off the statute book they seized its repeal as another element of agitation. But when we repealed it, we inserted in the law itself our reasons for doing so. Look into the 14th section of the Nebraska Kansas bill, the section which contains the repealing clause, and there you will find it stated in so many words, that the Missouri line is repealed because it is [in]consistent with the doctrine of non-interference by

[18] This statement is true but misleading. The idea was only *implicit* in the bill as reported by Douglas on January 4, 1854. Archibald Dixon of Kentucky on January 16 offered an amendment specifically repealing the Missouri Compromise. Douglas accepted this amendment. Cf. P. Orman Ray, "The Genesis of the Kansas-Nebraska Act," in American Historical Association, *Annual Report,* 1914, I (Washington, 1916), 259-80; *id., The Repeal of the Missouri Compromise* (Cleveland, 1909); James F. Rhodes, *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850 to the End of the Roosevelt Administration,* 9 vols. (New York, 1928), I, Chap. V; Milton, *The Eve of Conflict,* 109-14; Albert B. Hart, *Slavery and Abolition, 1831-1841* (New York, 1906), Chap. VII. French E. Chadwick, *Causes of the Civil War, 1859-1861* (New York, 1906), 58, says that in acting as he did, Douglas was "but yielding to an unconscious pressure which he could not resist. He 'rode the whirlwind' but did not 'direct the storm.' "

Congress with the question of slavery in the States and Territories. Every man who voted for that bill affirmed, under oath, that he was in favor of non-intervention in the future. Every Democrat, yes, every man of every party in Alabama who voted for that bill, affirmed non-intervention and swore to it. [Cheers.] Search the record; look at the votes of your Senators, and they declared, under oath, by their votes for the Nebraska bill, that the Missouri line was repealed because it was inconsistent with the doctrine of non-interference by Congress with slavery in the States and Territories, as affirmed in the Compromise measures of 1850. [Cheers.]

It is true that one or two Southern Senators came to me and wanted me to strike out those words—that reason for repealing the Missouri compromise. I asked them why they wanted these words stricken out. They replied that they desired to have them stricken out because they had voted against the compromise measures in 1850, and they did not now like to affirm them. [Laughter.] I said to the leading man with them, "Sir, I know you voted against the principle in 1850, but you took the back track afterwards and pledged yourselves to it in 1852. I hold you to that pledge." He answered that he was willing to stand by it, but he did not like to vote it. (Laughter.) I told him that I insisted he should vote it under oath. I left the words in, and made them all vote for the provision. ("Good," and cheers.) I thought that when they voted for the principle under oath I could trust them. [Laughter.] I not only made them, by their votes, for the Nebraska bill, pledge themselves to non-intervention in the future, but I made them also state the principle on which we were to act. I will quote the language of the clause which was inserted for the purpose of stating what principle we were acting on, and to prevent unscrupulous men from misrepresenting us. These are the words of the clause:

"It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any State or Territory, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." [Cheers.]

Here is the full length and breadth of popular sovereignty, or "squatter sovereignty," to which I ever went, or ever desired to go, ["Right," and cheers,] and for that every Southern Senator and Representative who voted for the Nebraska bill, and nearly every one of them did so vote—voted under oath.—The very men who now denounce me for advocating that doctrine, stood pledged to me and to the country that in the future they would help carry it out. ["They did," "True."] I have redeemed my pledge; I have stood faithful to the principle, and I am here to defend it to-day and to vindicate my own character, my own honor and my own consistency by the record. I assail no man, I impeach no man's motives, but I defy any man on earth to show that I have not strictly performed my pledge. [Cheers.]

When we assembled in Convention at Cincinnati, in June, 1856, for the purpose of nominating candidates for President and Vice President, and forming

a platform for the party, Alabama was represented. Her delegates did not come like most of the others, untrammelled and at liberty to do as they pleased; but they come [*sic*] like ambassadors, with their instructions in their hands—they came telling us that Alabama sent them to the Convention to vote for and pledge her support to the nominee, provided the National Democratic party affirmed the doctrine of non-intervention. [Cheers.] Illinois was represented there by as true a set of men as ever lived, with the gallant Richardson[14] at their head. He told the Alabama delegation that the terms their State presented were right and just; that the principle of non-intervention was the principle of the Constitution itself, the principle of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and that Illinois would stand by Alabama in demanding its recognition by the Convention. [Cheers.] The Democracy of Alabama entered into a solemn compact of honor at Cincinnati with the Democracy of each other State of the Union, that if they would adhere to non-intervention Alabama would.—We have adhered to it, and I now come to inquire whether Alabama is going to stand today by the terms on which she went to Cincinnati in 1856? ["We will;" "We hope so;" "We will in the end," and cheers.]

After the Convention adjourned at Charleston, and before it re-assembled at Baltimore[15] in the present year, I made a speech in the Senate in reply to Jefferson Davis and others, in which I offered the Alabama platform of 1856 as a basis of compromise and reconciliation. I did not ask at Charleston or at Baltimore any other or different platform than that which Alabama had prescribed at Cincinnati—when Mr. Buchanan was nominated.—[Cheers.] James Buchanan and John C. Breckinridge were nominated and elected on the platform of non-intervention. They never could have been elected on any other platform. [Applause.] The Cincinnati platform was adopted by the unanimous vote of the delegates from every State in the Union.—There was not one vote against it from any one State. It declared in so many words that this Union could only be preserved on the basis of non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the States or in the Territories. [Cheers.] When the Democratic party assembled at Charleston this year to nominate a candidate for the Presidency, the Northern Democracy came forward and asked that the Cincinnati platform might be re-affirmed in the precise words in which it stood, and had been adopted by Alabama; [laughter; but we were met by the delegation from

[14] The "gallant Richardson" was William A. Richardson, Douglas's chief lieutenant in the House, chairman of the House Committee on Territories, and unsuccessful opponent of Nathaniel P. Banks in the speakership contest of 1855-1856. See Fred H. Harrington, " 'The First Northern Victory,' " in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), V (1939), 186-205. In 1863 Richardson was elected to a seat in the Senate.

[15] On the Charleston, Richmond, and Baltimore conventions of 1860, cf. Emerson D. Fite, *The Presidential Campaign of 1860* (New York, 1911); Murat Halstead, *A History of the National Political Conventions of the Current Presidential Campaign* (Columbus, 1860); Milledge L. Bonham, Jr., "New York and the Election of 1860," in *New York History* (Albany, 1919-), XV (1934), 124-43.

your State, who told us that if we stood where Alabama stood four years ago, Alabama would bolt, [laughter and cheers,] telling us that the platform which Alabama adopted in 1856 was so rotten in 1860 that an honest man could not stand upon it. [Laughter and applause.] Is it true that Democratic principles become rotten so quick. ["No."] Men may get rotten, but principles are eternal. [Cheers.]

Why was there any secession from Charleston and Baltimore? The men who seceded tell the people that they were not willing to endorse Douglas and his squatter sovereignty notions. [Laughter and cheers.] I believe that is their excuse. ["That's it," "give it to them."] The record shows that excuse is not true. [Cheers.] I did not desire the Charleston or Baltimore Convention to endorse my opinions or any other person's opinions on popular sovereignty. [Cheers.] No friend of mine asked any new plank in the platform. No friend of mine desired one word or letter of the platform changed. We were for standing by the time-honored principles of the party, by the platform as it stood and had been ratified by the people in 1856, without the dotting of an i or the crossing of a t, and in favor of maintaining the organization of the party as a means of destroying Abolitionism and saving the country. [Cheers.] Hence it is not true that I or my friends, or any one of them, went to Charleston or Baltimore demanding that popular sovereignty, or "squatter sovereignty," should be endorsed. We went there in favor of the old platform and the old principles, willing to elect a man in 1860 upon the same principles upon which Buchanan and Breckinridge were elected in 1856. But here come some gentlemen from Alabama and others from Washington[16] with instructions from federal authority [a voice—"from the 'old public functionary,'"] that they must insert a new plank into the platform which Douglas would not stand upon or break up the party. ["That's truth."] They were certain that if they maintained the old platform, the time-honored principles of the party, that Douglas would stand on it until doomsday, [cheers,] and they were equally certain—and I thank them for the compliment—that if they reversed the principles of the party, if they abandoned the doctrine of non-intervention and went over to the old federal doctrine of Congressional intervention, that I would never stand on it. [Cheers.] The record shows, beyond the power of any candid man to deny it, that they abandoned the party at Charleston and Baltimore because the party would not abandon its principles.—["True, true."] Those who staid in the Convention were in

[16] Senator John Slidell of Louisiana went to Charleston, not as a delegate, but apparently as the agent of Buchanan to prevent the nomination of Douglas. Louis M. Sears, *John Slidell* (Durham, 1925), 163-64; Philip G. Auchampaugh, "The Buchanan-Douglas Feud," in *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* (Springfield, 1908-), XXV (1933), 5-48. Dean Richmond, chairman of the New York delegation, aided in this, hoping that with Douglas out of the way, the convention would turn to Horatio Seymour. Cf. "New York and the Election of 1860," in *loc. cit.*, 124-43; [James Buchanan], *Mr. Buchanan's Administration on the Eve of the Rebellion* (New York, 1866), 78.

favor of the organization of the party, its old platform and its old principles, those who bolted went out because the party would not change its principles on the most vital point. [Cheers.]

What good reason was there for the demand of a change in the platform? It is not a valid argument against a man to prove only that he has changed. I trust that we all grow wiser as we grow older, and just as fast as we become convinced of our error we ought to be frank enough and honest enough to confess it. I have no objection to a man who having held to one doctrine changes it, provided he will confess that he has changed and give me the reasons which produced his conversion. (Laughter and cheers.] Now, it may be possible that the same reasons which produced this sudden conversion in the minds of so many men, and satisfied them that that which was right in 1856 was wrong in 1860, that non-intervention was constitutional at one time and unconstitutional at another. I say it may be that if they had given me the reasons which wrought this change in their minds, it might have changed mine too. (Laughter and applause.) But let us see whether there was any good reason for their change. They say that Southern rights, Southern honor and Southern equality were all violated and forfeited under the doctrine of non-intervention.—How is it done? Why, they say that non-intervention and popular sovereignty is only a short cut to abolitionism. It is funny to hear these Southern and Northern interventionists talk on this question. The Abolitionists of the North say that if you allow the people to decide the question they will be sure to adopt slavery everywhere in the Territories, and the Southern interventionists say that if you allow the people to decide it they will be sure to abolish and prohibit slavery everywhere in the Territories. (Laughter and applause.)—The Abolition agitators declare that unless Congress prohibits slavery, "squatter" sovereignty will carry it everywhere, and in order to prove that this view of the matter is correct, they point to New Mexico and say, "look there! There is a country five times as large as New York, in a comparatively Northern climate and elevated above the sea, which was all free when we acquired it in 1848, but in 1858 the people, by the authority of 'squatter' sovereignty and by no other authority whatever, passed laws introducing, protecting and maintaining slavery there." (Cheers.)—That is the abolition argument to prove that popular sovereignty and non-intervention is all wrong, and that if the doctrine prevails the North have no chance and the South have it all their own way.—(Laughter.) Come down to Alabama and here the secessionists tell you that non-intervention and popular sovereignty is a short cut to Abolitionism; that if you allow the people to decide the question for themselves they will be sure to prohibit slavery, and that the South have no chance at all.

A voice—What do you tell them?

Mr. Douglas—I tell them that the true Democratic doctrine, the true doctrine of the Constitution, the great fundamental principle of free government the world over, is that every people on earth shall be allowed to make their own

laws, establish their own institutions, manage their own affairs, take care of their own negroes and mind their own business.—[Cheers.] That is the true Democratic doctrine as affirmed in our platforms in 1848, 1852, 1856, and 1860.

It does not vitiate the correctness of the principles whether slavery under it does or does not exist, and I will tell you why. Under that principle slavery will exist wherever the people want it, and will not exist anywhere else.—According to my knowledge of human nature, the people will want it wherever the climate and soil render it necessary and profitable, but wherever the climate is such that slavery is neither necessary [n]or profitable, the people will not have it, and no power in Christendom can force it on them. [Cheers.] This question of slavery is one of political economy depending upon the laws of climate, production and self-interest. You cannot compel slavery to exist in a cold, Northern latitude any more than by an act of Congress you can make cotton grow upon the tops of the Rocky Mountains. [Laughter and cheers.] Whenever you make up your minds to maintain slavery in those cold Northern regions, where the people do not want it and will not have it, you must first get an act of Congress compelling cotton, rice, sugar and tobacco to grow there, and then you can have negroes.—[Laughter and applause.] The dividing line between free States and slave States, between white labor and slave labor, cannot be determined by degrees of latitude. It is dependent upon climate rather than latitude and longitude, and climate is affected by elevation above the sea as much as it is by the degrees of latitude Northward. Hence, in a mountain region, where the land lies so high above the sea that there is scarce any summer, where tropical products will not grow, and where only the white man can live in health and comfort, there you cannot have slavery. And why do you want it? I never know [*sic*] that it was desirable for a people to have a thing that was not good for them.—[Laughter and cheers.] My idea is that a people, if they are capable of self-government, should be permitted to decide for themselves what laws are good and what laws are bad; and you have no more right to force a good thing on an unwilling people than you have to force a bad thing on them. [Laughter and cheers.] They are the best judges of what institutions will suit them and what will not.

But the fire-eaters tell you that if you allow the people to do as they please, under the limitations of the Constitution that the Yankees will just swarm into the new Territories and out-vote the Southern men. Well, I have not as bad an opinion of the Yankee as some people have; but I have not so good an opinion of him as to believe that he will carry his anti-slavery sentiments with him wherever he goes. (Cheers.) My opinion of the Yankee is the same as my opinion of the Southern man, that whenever he goes into a new State or Territory he will vote according to the opinions which prevail in the country in which he lives, and not according to the notions he brought with him from Yankee land. For instance, suppose we should acquire the Island of Cuba, and I trust we will very soon, (cheers,) and after we acquired it, it should be colon-

ized by Sumner, Seward, Chase, Giddings, Lincoln and men of that class, nobody but Abolitionists going there, do you think they would free the negroes in Cuba? ("No," and laughter.) How long would it be before they would each have a plantation? They might make some few excuses, saying that it made a great difference whether the slaves had Christian masters or not, and whether they had kind, prudent men to take care of them. (Cheers and laughter.) Any man of brains who will go to Cuba and stay a week will find that that Island with slave labor to secure tropical productions, is the choicest country on the face of the earth; but if their negroes were set free, with no power over them to direct them, they would be a curse to any country. Why is Cuba now more desirable than San Domingo? The latter has ten acres of good land to Cuba's one. San Domingo in the production of tropical staples would be worth ten times as much as Cuba; but for the fact that the negroes there have been turned loose and have become a curse to the Island, whereas in Cuba they have been kept in subjection, and there civilization can flourish. If we should take San Domingo, and then let the white people govern it they would establish slavery by the first act of their Legislature. (Cheers.) But to return. You have got some Yankees in Alabama, I presume. ("Yes," and laughter.) Some of them are overseers, and I have heard that they were noted for being very rigid in their treatment of the slaves. ["That's so."] Some of them are planters, and I never heard that they had any conscientious scruples about holding slaves. So far as I know the Yankee who goes South is the worst fire-eater in christendom. ["True," and laughter, "Not all of them."] I will permit you to judge for yourselves on that point; but I do aver that the most relentless, bitter, cruel, persecuting Abolitionists in the whole Northern country, are the Southern men of Southern birth, who sold their negroes, moved into Illinois, bought land with the proceeds, got rich on the rise of property, and turned Republicans, in order to get office. [Cheers.] If there are any of them who are a little worse than the balance, it is a few from Alabama who[m] I remember now.[17] [Laughter and cheers.] The fact is, take Southern men into a country where slavery is not profitable, and they will be opposed to it. Take Northern men into a country where slavery is necessary under the climate and profitable, and there they will protect it.

But what did the seceders at Charleston and Baltimore want?

They wanted a clause affirming the duty of Congress to protect slave property in the same manner as other property. I believe that is a fair statement: is it not? ["It is."] I would not misrepresent them for the world. I always like to state an opponent fairly, and then answer his objections. I repeat, then, that they desire that Congress shall protect slave property in the Territories just like all other property. I can pardon small politicians, who have no opinions but those they learn from their ambitious leaders, when they talk nonsense; ["Hit them again," and cheers;] but when statesmen, Senators, candidates for the

[17] Doubtless an allusion to James G. Birney.

Presidency, assume to palm off a falsehood on the American people, by vague phrases, that convey an erroneous impression, I am amazed at the attempt. They want Congress to protect slavery the same as it does horses and cattle and merchandize in a Territory! Do they not know that Congress never yet protected horses or cattle or merchandize, or any other property, in an organized Territory? [Laughter and applause.]

When did Congress ever pass a law creating a criminal code for any organized Territory? Suppose you go to a Territory, and your horse is stolen, what act of Congress is violated? ("Let them have it," and great laughter and applause.) I defy these men who want slave property protected like other property, to show me a case where Congress ever passed a law for an organized Territory punishing murder, robbery, larceny, or any other crime whatever. All Congress does is to call into existence the Territorial Government, allow the people to elect their members of the Legislature, and then make their own criminal code, and protect their own property.—("Right," and applause.) Do you not suppose that Major Breckinridge and his co-workers know these facts? What excuse can be made for Senators and Representatives who attempt to deceive the American people by holding out the idea that Congress protects all other property in a Territory, and will not protect slave property. (Laughter and applause.)

I claim to know what I am talking about in speaking of our Territorial policy. A man sometimes has peculiar opportunities of knowing. I was Chairman of the Committee on Territories of the House, before I went to the Senate, and since I have been in the Senate, I served as Chairman of the same committee for eleven years in succession. During that period I drew up the bills which admitted Texas, Iowa, Wisconsin, California, Minnesota and Oregon into the Union. During that same period I wrote the bills to organize the Territories of Oregon, Minnesota, Washington, Utah, New Mexico, Kansas and Nebraska.—By this time I ought to know something about our Territorial policy and Territorial legislation, and I tell you that no man of ordinary intelligence and brains has any excuse for pretending that Congress ever protected horses, cattle, or other property in a Territory, any more than it protected negro slaves. [Cheers.]

These gentlemen forget that we are living under a Federal Government of limited powers. What provision of the Constitution gives Congress the right to legislate concerning my horses or my cattle, or my merchandize, or your negroes, outside of the Fugitive Slave Law? Persons and property, under our system of government, are dependent upon local law for protection, and not upon Congress.—[Cheers.] What right has Congress to interfere with your horses, your merchandize, your negroes, in Alabama? Why do you not demand that negroes in Alabama shall be protected by Congress, the same as other property? [Laughter.] Why, there is not a schoolboy twelve years old, but what knows that Congress has no business to interfere with either.

And yet, all this prejudice against me, for not being faithful to the principles of the Constitution, has been produced in the minds of the people by this miserable system of [mis]representation.

If you once grant what they all know to be true, that all property, and all persons, under our system, are under the local law for their protection, there is an end of all talk about Squatter Sovereignty. [Cheers.] These gentlemen say that they demand, and they are going to fight for the right to carry their negroes into the Territory, on the same terms that a Northern man carries his horses. Who ever denied the right? But they are going to fight on it. What is the use of fighting about it, if nobody ever disputed it. The only question is, on what terms does a Northern man carry his property into a Territory? I assert that all men, citizens of all the States, free and slave, may go into a Territory, and carry with them property of any description, in terms of exact equality, subject to the local law. [Cheers.] Horses, negroes, merchandize, every kind of property, goes subject to the local law. Why do not these gentlemen tell you so? If they did, they could not make any capital by misrepresentation. It would end their charge that we will not deal by your property as we deal by our own.

But they tell us that if slave property goes into a Territory, subject to the local law, perhaps it will not be protected—that it may be kept out by non-action or unfriendly legislation. Certainly it may, and so may other kinds of property. If a Northern man, or a Southern man either, who is dealing in groceries, determines to move to Kansas, he had better inquire, before he takes his brandies and whiskies with him, whether the Maine liquor law is in force there, [Laughter,] for if it should happen to be, he might consider it such unfriendly legislation as would interfere with his right to sell. [Laughter.] Every legislative body on earth is in the habit of discriminating, by friendly or unfriendly legislation, between different kinds of property. I suppose no man will dispute that. I presume that it is the case in Alabama. I do not know, but I take it for granted that you exempt church property, libraries, mechanics' tools, and a great variety of favored articles. I suppose that is the practice here; I know it is in most of the States. You favor it because you think that you ought to encourage certain occupations and pursuits for the good of the society; and on the other hand, you put high duties on certain things which you wish to discourage. You will find a good example in point in Kansas Territory.

Some time ago they discovered in that Territory, that a great many men were engaged in buying Mustang ponies, down in Texas and Mexico, and driving them up through Kansas into Illinois, for sale, where they brought about twelve dollars a-piece. These dealers were in the habit of turning their ponies out on the plains of Kansas, to let them fatten, before presenting them for sale; and, inasmuch as in a new Territory the people are not all rail-splitters, and have not time to fence in any land except that which they cultivate, the inhabitants of Kansas, who were obliged to let their cattle run loose, found that the ming-

ling of the Mustangs with their stock was a great public injury. What did they do? They put a tax of ten dollars a head on every Mustang brought into the Territory, and released all blooded stock from taxation. There you have an example of friendly and unfriendly legislation. I do not know whether that is Constitutional or not; but all I have got to say, is, that if the law is Constitutional, the people of Kansas have a right to it. If it is not Constitutional, the Court will so decide, and then it becomes void.

But I deny that Congress can determine the question, whether the law is Constitutional or not. If any man feels aggrieved under that law, let him bring his case in the Territorial Courts, and appeal it to the Supreme Court of the United States. When that Court pronounces its judgment, every good man must abide the result. So it is with the negro question. Two years ago New Mexico passed a law introducing and maintaining slavery in that Territory. By what authority? Simply by that authority which my enemies call "Squatter Sovereignty." [Cheers.] But, about the same time, the Legislature of Kansas passed a law prohibiting slavery in that Territory. Now, the Black Republicans want Congress to repeal the slave code of New Mexico, and the fire-eaters want Congress to repeal the law prohibiting slavery in Kansas. I tell them "Never." It shall not repeal either, if I can prevent it. [Cheers.]

If the people of New Mexico want slavery, let them have it. It is their business—not ours. If the act is unconstitutional, make a case, and take it to the courts, and get their decision, and there is an end of it. If the fire-eaters want to repeal the legislation of Kansas against slavery, I tell them it is not to be done, if the prohibition is Constitutional. The people of Kansas had a right to pass it, if it is Constitutional; and if you doubt its Constitutionality, take it before the courts and get a decision, which is final, and there is an end of the controversy. There can be no excuse, no pretext, for bringing it back into Congress. Then why do these secessionists desire Congress to interfere with this question?—But they say they do not ask Congress to interfere, only when necessary. When is it necessary, in their estimation, for Congress to interfere and protect slavery? Not where the people want it, as in New Mexico; for wherever the people want it they will pass laws themselves to protect it. Hence, these Breckinridge men want Congress to interfere and maintain slavery wherever the people do not want it, and will not have it.

On the other hand the Black Republicans North tell us that they do not care about Congress prohibiting slavery where the people are opposed to it; for wherever the people do not want it they will prohibit it themselves, as they did in Kansas. They only want Congress to interfere and prohibit it where the people want to have it. Thus you find the Black Republicans in favor of having Congress prohibit slavery wherever the people want to have it, and the Breckinridge secessionists demand that Congress shall maintain and protect slavery wherever the people do not want it. They agree in principle. In fact, they are

only two different factions of the same party. [Tremendous applause and laughter.]

In the first place, the Breckinridge men and the Lincoln men agree that this slavery question shall be kept in Congress forever. They agree, in the next place, that Congress, and not the people, shall decide it. They agree, in the third place, that whenever Congress does decide it, they must determine it against the wishes of the people interested in it.—They agree, in the fourth place, in ridiculing, denouncing, and scouting non intervention and popular sovereignty. Agreeing thus far, they only differ as to which way Congress shall decide it. The Black Republicans want the decision in favor of the North and against the South, in all cases whatsoever, and the secessionists desire to have it against the North and in favor of the South. Each appeals to the passions and prejudices of their own section, against the peace and harmony of the whole country.

Now let me ask you, Southern men, what you are to gain by keeping this question in Congress? ["Nothing."] If you continue to do it, and the agitation goes on, you cannot fail to see the end. All Northern men will rally under one banner, and all Southern men will rally under an opposite banner; and thus two great hostile parties will be formed, with an "irreconcilable conflict" between them. Those of us who will join not either faction, are to be crushed out. Your Lincolns and Sewards will take the places of National men in the North; and the Union men in the South will fast disappear. Your Fire-Eaters, Secessionists, and Disunionists are to take the places of conservative men; and thus this country is to be the scene of a perpetual conflict between hostile sections. What will this country gain by such agitation? ["Nothing."]

I put the question to the Abolitionists of the North, what good they have done to the negro? What one slave have they emancipated? What one foot of American soil have they driven slavery from? and then I ask them whether have they not forced the master to draw the cord tighter, and to observe a degree of rigor in the treatment of their slaves which their own feelings would like to ameliorate, if the Abolitionists would permit them to live in safety, under a milder rule. ["True" and applause.] If the agitation has been a curse to the negro, without one redeeming feature, let us see what good it has done the white man. What good will it do you of the South, if you precipitate a sectional conflict, and divide parties by a geographical line. Is it assuming too much, when we undertake to say that the stronger will outvote the weaker. I belong to the stronger section, and I would deem myself a traitor to my country if I should exercise the power merely because we have got it.

But if you force this question into Congress; if you break up the Democratic party, unless you can keep it there, you may get Abolitionists in the place of every National man from the North, and then what kind of protection will you get for your slave property from an Abolition Congress? I will tell you what kind of protection you will get. That protection which a grizzly bear gives a child. You will find it will be squeezed to death in the gentle embrace. You

will get that kind of protection which a wolf gives a lamb. Protection to slave property by an Abolition Congress! And the same men who tell you that they are going to keep the question in Congress, and that they are determined to be protected by Congress, at the same time tell you that Northern men are so faithless that they will not even perform their Constitutional obligations.

Do you think there is a solitary fire-eater in all America who believes that his party can procure an act of Congress protecting slavery, and enforcing its existence, where the people do not want it? I do not think there is one of them who would risk his character by pretending that he did. Then why do they make the demand? Do they make it just for the purpose of having it rejected? Does it elevate the character of the Southern people to make a demand, and threaten to dissolve the Union if they do not get it, when they do not get it, when they do not intend to fight on it if they are refused? What is the inference? The only inference I can draw is, that these men desire a pretext for breaking up this Union. In order to get that pretext, they are going to make a demand that Congress shall pass a law which they know will never be passed. They are going to inflame Southern passion, and make such a law the condition upon which they will remain in the Union; and when it is refused, they will ask you to break up the Union because of that refusal.

I appeal to you to know whether you have any interest in this question of allowing Congress to take charge of your slaves. Whenever you recognize the power of Congress over slave property, your rights are gone.

What kind of protection do they want? Why, they say that Douglas, in one of his speeches in Illinois—perhaps at Freeport—declared that non-action by a Territorial Legislature was equivalent to the exclusion of slavery. I do tell them so; and some of their members of Congress had told them so before I made the speech. Howell Cobb, of Georgia, told the people of Pennsylvania the same thing, at Westchester, in September, 1856; and Old Buck made him Secretary of the Treasury because he did. James L. Orr, of South Carolina, who was lately speaker of the House of Representatives, made a speech in 1856 to the same effect. Southern men generally uttered the same great truth. You know that if you had no laws in Alabama to make negro-stealing a crime, no police regulations, no patrol system, no officers to prevent men from trading with your negroes at night, and selling them liquor—if you had no such laws, or police of any kind, your slave property would not be worth a farthing. Non-action is practical exclusion.

The fire-eaters say that if the Legislature does not enact laws for its protection, then Congress must. Well, let us illustrate this interference of Congress. Congress takes up one section of your slave code, which provides that if a man does not feed his negro properly he shall be indicted. I suppose that is a law in this State. I reckon it is. Mr. Seward moves to amend, that if he does not feed them with so many pounds of fresh beef, so many pounds of corn beef, so many chickens, so much venison and other fine food, he shall be indicted. [Laughter.]

There is then another section read, which provides that any man who does not clothe his negro properly shall be indicted, and Mr. Seward amends this by specifying what kind of clothing they shall furnish. He then demands that the ten hour system shall prevail among the slaves, as it does in the Eastern factories, and that no slave shall be forced to work before seven o'clock in the morning, and after five in the afternoon. Let Mr. Seward go on in this way, and get up a protective law for your property, and what is your property worth? Whenever you permit Congress to touch your slave property you have lost its value.

I hold that man to be your worst enemy who will go for Congressional intervention at all. Then my friends why is this agitation kept up? All experience proves, that so long as Congress does not touch the question there will be peace, and whenever Congress does interfere there is strife. Then why not banish it from the halls of Congress? The Democratic party now stands where it stood in 1848, under Cass, in 1852, under Pierce, in 1856, under Buchanan and Breckinridge, and in 1860, at Charleston, proclaiming Non-interference by Congress with the subject of slavery everywhere. If the people want it, they will pass laws to protect it; if they do not want it, no power on earth can force it on them. The only question then is, whether the people will want it or not. The people will want it wherever the climate renders slavery necessary and desirable, and they will not want it where the climate renders slavery unprofitable and undesirable. It is a question of climate, to be determined by soil and productions, and self-interest, and not a question of legislation. Show me a country where rice, cotton, and sugar are the principal staples, and I will show you a country where slavery would exist if there was no man but an Abolitionist living in it. [Laughter and cheers.]

These fire-eaters tell you that the people of the North are more numerous than the people of the South, and, therefore, if you allow the people to settle this question, the Yankees will outvote you. Do you think the Yankee would vote irrespective of his interest? ["No, he is not a fool," and laughter.] Suppose a Yankee goes South, where the white man cannot work and the negro is in his element. That Yankee never becomes a slaveholder, does he? ["Well he does," and laughter.] Go into Mississippi, or elsewhere, and show me a Yankee who went there, became an overseer, and when the owner of the plantation died, married the widow, and I will show you a fire-eater of the purest stripe. [Shouts of laughter and applause.] A Yankee, when he goes South, naturally thinks that he ought to get as much work out of a negro as is required from white hands up in his native North. He finds that the negro cannot labor so hard in this climate, and while forcing him to do quite as much, he thinks he is the most humane man living, because he does not get more work out of him than he could get out of a white man North!

Suppose we should acquire the Island of Cuba, and a pestilence should sweep off every human being from it, and then it should be colonized by Seward and Giddings, with their Emigrant Aid Societies, no man being permitted to go

there who was not an Abolitionists [*sic*], how long would they be in Cuba before they would establish slavery? How long before they would open the African slave trade? It does not matter where a man comes from when he settles in a country, he will advocate that line of policy and legislation which he thinks the good of the community in which he lives, his own interests, and those of his children require. A wise statesman will always adapt his laws to the wants and condition and circumstances of the people to be affected by them.

I believe there is a conspiracy on foot to break up this Union. It is the duty of every good citizen to frustrate the scheme. If Lincoln is elected, he owes it to the Breckinridge men, and then they tell us, after having tried to secure that result by dividing the party, that if he is elected they are going to dissolve the Union. At Norfolk, Va., they wanted to know whether, if Lincoln was elected, I would help them dissolve the Union. I told them never on earth. [Cheers.]

There is no living man who would do more to defeat Lincoln than myself. There is no man more anxious to defeat him than myself. And I would have no trouble in beating him to death, but for the support given him by the Breckinridge men. If Lincoln is elected, he must be inaugurated. And after he is inaugurated, if he attempts to violate any man's rights, or the Constitution of the country, we will punish him according to the Constitution, to the extent of the law. Notwithstanding the combination between the Breckinridge men and the Black Republicans at the North, we have already succeeded in ensuring the election of enough Douglas Democrats, united with the South, to outvote the Black Republicans. We shall hold both Houses of Congress against him during his term, if he should be elected.

I hold that the election of any man on earth by the American people, according to the Constitution, is no justification for breaking up this government. The Constitution has provided a means for punishing traitors, and it applies to men high in office as well as out of office. I will go for punishing an overt act, but not for breaking up the government.—[Cheers.] In conclusion, I desire to say that I regret the necessity that I have had for using a harsh word. Hunted down by a body of slanderers against my character, I felt bound to repel their charge with the indignation which it deserved. ["You are right," "Good," and cheers.]

Let the Union men of this country rally, let all the friends of Constitutional principles, of Constitutional government, all the enemies of sectional strife and agitation, rally around the principle of non-intervention, and we will crush out Northern abolitionism and Southern disunion. [Cheers.]

My friends there is a limit to every man's exertions.[18] ["Go on," "Go on."] I would be glad to address you until sunset, but I have other duties to perform, and I owe an apol[o]gy to these ladies whom I have kept here so long in an

[18] It has been stated that Douglas took four hours to deliver this address. Yancey's reply, that evening, "was not, lighted with Yancey's familiar genius." DuBose, *Yancey*, 535.

uncomfortable position, they being obliged to remain by the crowd. I do not know how to express to you the gratitude I feel for the patience and kindness with which you have listened to me. It is due to those who differ with me in opinion—and I take it for granted there are some, perhaps many in this large crowd of that class—to say, that while they may take a course which I deeply lament as destructive of our government, they know when they go to a public meeting how to conduct themselves as gentlemen. They have certainly done so on this occasion.—While I always express my opinions with entire freedom, and without the slightest reservation or concealment, it is never my purpose to wound the sensibilities of any one, much less to say that which shall give just cause of offence. I always speak freely, boldly and unequivocally when I speak at all, but I recognize those courtesies and proprieties of life which a gentleman never forgets. I thank you all.

He retired amidst tremendous applause by the assembled multitude.[19]

[19] Douglas went that night by boat to Selma, and after speaking there, went on to Mobile, where, the evening before the election, "a large crowd cheered his plea that Alabama had more security within than without the Union." Next day he heard the news of the election in the office of his friend, John Forsyth, editor of the unionist Mobile *Register.* Milton, *The Eve of Conflict,* 500.

Book Reviews

The Repressible Conflict, 1830-1861. By Avery Craven. (University, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1939. Pp. xii, 97. $1.50.)

This delightful little book consists of the second series of the Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History which Professor Craven delivered at Louisiana State University in February, 1938. His general theme is that the Civil War was not inevitable but for the foolishness of men who let their emotions run away with their reason. If this conclusion is not entirely novel, the argument is presented in a manner both refreshing and stimulating.

Although the South, like other great sections, contained elements of unity, its interests and social attitudes were so diverse that its people never thought seriously of separate nationality until fused into something like unity by pressure from without. This pressure began with the abolitionist crusade which forced the Southerners into a defense not merely of slavery but, finally, of the whole economic and social structure of their section. The abolitionists never bothered to find out what slavery in the South was actually like: they began with the assumption that it was wholly evil and the slaveholders depraved and launched into a perfect ecstasy of vilification. The incensed Southerners replied in kind. As the campaign of exaggerated accusation progressed, sectional economic and political rivalries became linked with the contest over slavery and added more clamor to the din of mutual recrimination. Thus the leaders of the industrial groups of the Northeast, who had been contending with the agriculturists of the South and West since the days of Hamilton and Jefferson, saw in the slavery issue an opportunity to split the agrarians, whose ablest leaders were Southern planters, by arousing the West against the South. They therefore aided the "holy war" against the Southern "aristocracy," less because they disliked slavery than because they wished to break the political power of their opponents. By the time the North was sufficiently united on this program to elect Lincoln in 1860, the campaign of hate had gone so far that reconciliation was impossible. "God's purposes" must be fulfilled by a bloody war.

The three lectures, "Foundations of Southern Nationalism," "The Peculiar Institution," and "The Repressible Conflict," are well articulated and, although there is necessarily some repetition, they flow along in logical sequence. While the chief interest of the special student will be in the interpretation, the general

reader who has derived his knowledge of the period from textbooks and the older "standard" histories will find the evidence a revelation and will relish the delightfully easy and informal style. Teachers who have struggled with the intricacies of the subject will be grateful for Craven's gift for luminous exposition, for his ability to reveal in simple terms the essence of things which many have sensed but found hard to make clear to their students. For instance, his analysis of "the peculiar institution" is an excellent example of how informed common sense may be applied to historical interpretation. The reader feels that the situation described was a perfectly natural one for its time. Such art is possible only when a discerning mind is sustained by ripe scholarship.

The little book is beautifully printed and is a credit to the Louisiana State University Press. Because it is published primarily to make the lectures available to those who were not privileged to hear them, the usual footnotes and index have been omitted.

The University of Texas CHARLES W. RAMSDELL

The Biography of a River Town: Memphis, Its Heroic Age. By Gerald M. Capers, Jr. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. xiv, 292. Bibliography, illustrations, tables, maps, and charts. $3.50.)

This is a refreshing and enlightening history of a city. Books of this type are too often of two classes; first, those hack jobs which proceed from mayor to mayor in deadly monotony, and second, the literary effusions which run entirely to "color" and patriotism. Mr. Gerald Capers of Yale University could not be dull even on assignment, and he is too good an historian to be misled by a chamber of commerce. His history of Memphis is as excellent a job as one would expect.

Mr. Capers has taken great pains to tie in his story of Memphis with the city's hinterland, with the great variety of regional factors, and with national crosscurrents. This is as it should be. Memphis did not grow up in a vacuum and could not be understood in one. In this phase of the book the most important contribution is a well-reasoned analysis which demonstrates beyond quibble that Memphis and all the Mississippi River cities belong to the West, whether they are located north or south. One is certainly led into an impenetrable fog in any attempt to unravel the story of a river town with no better thread to follow than Southernism; on this point the reviewer speaks from painful experience in dealing with the past of New Orleans.

The history of Memphis is divided by the author into several fairly well-defined periods. There is first an Indian phase, then a frontier phase, in which the community was dominated by flatboatmen, then a period of growth following the victory of law and order (more or less) over the flatboatmen, followed in

turn pretty closely by the Civil War, Reconstruction, and finally, after 1880, the emergence of the modern city. This division makes sense. In each of these periods or phases the development of the community is treated as a whole, and the details of mayoral elections are most happily omitted. One is grateful also to miss slavish adherence to a rigid chronology. The result is that a picture of community growth, and a feeling of understanding what that growth means, emerge with very gratifying clarity.

The book has another virtue in that it supplies its own color. The history of Memphis needs no special emphasis with a heavy brush. Mr. Capers has wisely chosen to let his Indians, flatboatmen, Negroes, local heroes, and yellow fever mosquitoes parade without adornment. To decorate these characters with fancy writing would be something of a record in gilding the lily.

Memphis today is much like any other American city, but in its heroic age, says Mr. Capers, it had a quality all its own. Perhaps quality is an ill-chosen word, tending to be misleading. This special character, not wholly agreeable, derived from an extraordinary blending of frontier, slavery, aliens, rugged individualism, yellow fever, war, cotton, and more cotton, and more cotton. The town was boisterous; life was raw and cheap, but one must perforce accept Mr. Capers' adjectives "protean and virile."

The weaknesses of Mr. Capers' book are corollary to its virtues. In his effort to tie up the story of Memphis with regional and national affairs he has been led inevitably into many generalizations, some of which are not easy to accept. Specifically, he explains the postwar cotton planter's credit system as something new (p. 220), whereas it was almost as old as cotton planting. In the same connection one finds a glib reference to the breakup of the large plantations; the reviewer believes it can be shown that concentration of land ownership intensified after the Civil War. More examples could be cited.

In similar fashion, the abandonment of strict chronology and the cavalier disregard of mayors produce defects as well as advantages. There is sometimes a little confusion and overlapping; a previously unmentioned mayor is sometimes casually referred to without adequate indentification. As a matter of fact, other characters suffer from this disrespect on occasion, and are introduced by their bare surnames.

Finally, in treating whole periods of the city's history as units there is a certain repetitiousness which tends to mar the effect. The victory of respectable citizens over the flatboatmen is a case in point; it appears in a half dozen places.

All these matters are as nothing, however, when measured against the success of the whole book. Mr. Capers has set a high mark for scholars to shoot at.

Georgia State College for Women MACK SWEARINGEN

From Mill Wheel to Plowshare: The Story of the Contribution of the Christian Orndorff Family to the Social and Industrial History of the United States. By Julia Angeline Drake and James Ridgely Orndorff. (Cedar Rapids: The Torch Press, 1938. Pp. xii, 271. Illustrations, appendix. $3.00.)

This chronicle, historical and genealogical, covers the annals of the Christian Orndorff family in America. Commencing with the initial emigration from the German Palatinate to Pennsylvania in 1741, it portrays in panorama their successive settlements and westward migrations down to a recent period. Intelligent, hardheaded, thrifty, and warmhearted, the Orndorffs made their way surely in the New World, devoting their economic efforts mainly to grain milling and farming. As good churchmen of the Protestant faith and as good citizens, they played their part in the several communities which they founded and developed. The first Christian settled in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, and his son, Major Christian, near Hagerstown, Maryland. The Major and his family, imbued with a love of freedom, participated actively in the preliminaries of the American Revolution. After hostilities began, they sent a constant stream of wagons loaded with flour to Baltimore and the vicinity to feed the soldiers fighting the British, while simultaneously giving valuable military aid to the Colonial army. The descendants of Major Orndorff principally moved to western Virginia shortly before 1800, and a few years later to the Red River Valley of Kentucky. Members of the Kentucky group settled in Central Illinois as early as 1827, and their milling and farming activities were subsequently transferred to their new homes. The Illinois group later adopted the spelling Orendorff. In Kentucky their interests were extended to include the operation of sawmills, woolen factories, and tanneries. Captain John, of the Red River, displayed a noteworthy inventive ability, his ideas embracing improvement of various types of milling machinery, a cotton press, and a diving bell. In 1852 William J. Orendorff of Illinois became the partner of William Parlin, who had established at Canton, a decade earlier, one of the first factories for making steel plows. Parlin & Orendorff built up a large and extensive business which remained in existence until 1919 when it was purchased by the International Harvester Company.

The subtitle of the volume, and references to family accounts, diaries, and letters consulted, would lead the reader to expect an adequate discussion of the social life of the family at various times and places, and also a full account of the grain milling industry with which they were so closely concerned for nearly two hundred years. Unfortunately both of these subjects, particularly the latter, have been largely neglected, thereby considerably lessening the value of the treatise. The early portion of the story is fragmentary in character, and the book as a whole poorly organized. The format and printing are good, and the text well illustrated. The story is supplemented with an appendix, containing documentary material pertaining to members of the Orndorff family, a list of the collateral descendants of Major Christian Orndorff and his wife, Elizabeth

Hoffman, footnotes, and a brief index. The footnotes would be more usable if they were placed at the bottom of each page rather than at the end of the volume.

In spite of the limitations of *From Mill Wheel to Plowshare,* the underlying feeling of deep attachment to the members of the Orndorff family, and the appreciation of their qualities, including character, which the authors display throughout the book, carry the reader along from page to page with increasing interest. This feeling and understanding ring true, notwithstanding the lack of critical appraisal of individuals, and do much to leave the final impression that here is a record, partial though it may be, of a sturdy and practical pioneer family, who have played their part honorably and well in the making of America.

McCormick Historical Association HERBERT A. KELLAR

The Bonapartes in America. By Clarence Edward Macartney and Gordon Dorrance. (Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company, 1939. Pp. 286. Bibliography, illustrations, chart. $3.00.)

By using the above title, authors Macartney and Dorrance hoped to bind together into a sort of unity many diverse though interesting facts relating to the Bonapartes, to their descendants, and to some of Napoleon's soldiers. The ostensible touchstone is their relationship in some way to America. The well-known story of Jerome Bonaparte and Elizabeth Patterson is retailed at considerable length and this family line is brought on down to extinction with the passing of Charles J. Bonaparte, Theodore Roosevelt's attorney general. The other parts most logically making up the unity of this book are the accounts of Joseph Bonaparte's residence in New Jersey for nineteen years and of the exile of Louis Napoleon, later Napoleon III, in New York for a year.

Beyond this point the line of procedure becomes quite attenuated and strained, and in fact before this point has been reached it is evident that the authors have loaded their subjects with more than their title will bear, for much space is used in presenting the various characters apart from their relationship to America. There is practically no excuse for the chapter on Napoleon III and the Mexican crisis and even less for the short chapter on the Louisiana purchase. It is some embellishment to the Bonapartes to bring into the picture the French soldiers who emigrated to America, such as those attempting to form settlements in Alabama and in Texas and the Murats in Florida; and there is some logic in going into the Marshal Ney legend again, but the authors add nothing to what is already known and do not indeed summarize well the established facts concerning this intriguing speculation. Napoleon's illegitimate children are awarded a chapter because one is supposed to have lived in San Francisco, and the various plots to rescue Napoleon receive a chapter, in which the New Orleans activities are mentioned, resulting in the building of a boat and the construction of a house for his residence, which still stands.

Though this book is presented as adding much to previously known facts on the Bonapartes, there is little in it that has not already been written in various secondary works; and there is practically no evidence of any discovery or use of hitherto unused documents. There are few footnotes to important statements or quoted matter. The bibliography is inadequately presented in each item and it is in its whole make-up almost entirely secondary material, unless there is virtue in such a bibliographical item as "American and Foreign Journals and Newspapers of the day." The book has the saving grace of being interesting reading.

University of Georgia — E. MERTON COULTER

A French Regicide in Alabama, 1824-1837. By John Charles Dawson. (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 1939. Pp. 59. Bibliography.)

This brief monograph sketches the life of Joseph Lakanal who played a minor role in France, 1792-1815, sojourned in the United States during the Restoration, and later returned to his native country. The title, however, is somewhat misleading, as one half of this study deals with his French career and only fourteen pages are devoted to his life in Alabama.

Lakanal, apostate priest and regicide, was a member of the National Convention and was conspicuous in the subsequent establishment of the French Normal School. Somewhat lukewarm toward Napoleon, still he held office under him. Fleeing to the United States in early 1816, Lakanal spent six restless years in Kentucky, engaged in various activities: traveling, corresponding with Napoleonic conspirators, and giving assistance to the ephemeral Vine and Olive Company at Demopolis, Alabama, of which he was a stockholder, though never a resident of that colony. From May, 1822, to July, 1823, he was president of the College of Orleans in New Orleans, and from then (1823) until his return to France in 1837, he tried to play the role of a slaveholding planter near Mobile. Unfitted for the frontier life of a planter, disappointed, perhaps, at his failure to secure the presidency of the newly founded University of Alabama (1831), and disillusioned in general, Lakanal returned to his native land in 1837, a few years after receiving notification of his re-election to membership in the restored Academy of Moral and Political Sciences. He died in 1845.

Washington and Lee University — W. G. BEAN

Segments of Southern Thought. By Edd Winfield Parks. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1938. Pp. ix, 392. $3.00.)

The author who collects his scattered essays and publishes them in volume form subjects himself to a doubly rigid criticism, for the question immediately arises as to the need or desirability of reprinting what has already been given to the public. Such a miscellany is justified if the essays are too valuable to remain

Though this book is presented as adding much to previously known facts on the Bonapartes, there is little in it that has not already been written in various secondary works; and there is practically no evidence of any discovery or use of hitherto unused documents. There are few footnotes to important statements or quoted matter. The bibliography is inadequately presented in each item and it is in its whole make-up almost entirely secondary material, unless there is virtue in such a bibliographical item as "American and Foreign Journals and Newspapers of the day." The book has the saving grace of being interesting reading.

University of Georgia — E. MERTON COULTER

A French Regicide in Alabama, 1824-1837. By John Charles Dawson. (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 1939. Pp. 59. Bibliography.)

This brief monograph sketches the life of Joseph Lakanal who played a minor role in France, 1792-1815, sojourned in the United States during the Restoration, and later returned to his native country. The title, however, is somewhat misleading, as one half of this study deals with his French career and only fourteen pages are devoted to his life in Alabama.

Lakanal, apostate priest and regicide, was a member of the National Convention and was conspicuous in the subsequent establishment of the French Normal School. Somewhat lukewarm toward Napoleon, still he held office under him. Fleeing to the United States in early 1816, Lakanal spent six restless years in Kentucky, engaged in various activities: traveling, corresponding with Napoleonic conspirators, and giving assistance to the ephemeral Vine and Olive Company at Demopolis, Alabama, of which he was a stockholder, though never a resident of that colony. From May, 1822, to July, 1823, he was president of the College of Orleans in New Orleans, and from then (1823) until his return to France in 1837, he tried to play the role of a slaveholding planter near Mobile. Unfitted for the frontier life of a planter, disappointed, perhaps, at his failure to secure the presidency of the newly founded University of Alabama (1831), and disillusioned in general, Lakanal returned to his native land in 1837, a few years after receiving notification of his re-election to membership in the restored Academy of Moral and Political Sciences. He died in 1845.

Washington and Lee University — W. G. BEAN

Segments of Southern Thought. By Edd Winfield Parks. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1938. Pp. ix, 392. $3.00.)

The author who collects his scattered essays and publishes them in volume form subjects himself to a doubly rigid criticism, for the question immediately arises as to the need or desirability of reprinting what has already been given to the public. Such a miscellany is justified if the essays are too valuable to remain

Though this book is presented as adding much to previously known facts on the Bonapartes, there is little in it that has not already been written in various secondary works; and there is practically no evidence of any discovery or use of hitherto unused documents. There are few footnotes to important statements or quoted matter. The bibliography is inadequately presented in each item and it is in its whole make-up almost entirely secondary material, unless there is virtue in such a bibliographical item as "American and Foreign Journals and Newspapers of the day." The book has the saving grace of being interesting reading.

University of Georgia — E. MERTON COULTER

A French Regicide in Alabama, 1824-1837. By John Charles Dawson. (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 1939. Pp. 59. Bibliography.)

This brief monograph sketches the life of Joseph Lakanal who played a minor role in France, 1792-1815, sojourned in the United States during the Restoration, and later returned to his native country. The title, however, is somewhat misleading, as one half of this study deals with his French career and only fourteen pages are devoted to his life in Alabama.

Lakanal, apostate priest and regicide, was a member of the National Convention and was conspicuous in the subsequent establishment of the French Normal School. Somewhat lukewarm toward Napoleon, still he held office under him. Fleeing to the United States in early 1816, Lakanal spent six restless years in Kentucky, engaged in various activities: traveling, corresponding with Napoleonic conspirators, and giving assistance to the ephemeral Vine and Olive Company at Demopolis, Alabama, of which he was a stockholder, though never a resident of that colony. From May, 1822, to July, 1823, he was president of the College of Orleans in New Orleans, and from then (1823) until his return to France in 1837, he tried to play the role of a slaveholding planter near Mobile. Unfitted for the frontier life of a planter, disappointed, perhaps, at his failure to secure the presidency of the newly founded University of Alabama (1831), and disillusioned in general, Lakanal returned to his native land in 1837, a few years after receiving notification of his re-election to membership in the restored Academy of Moral and Political Sciences. He died in 1845.

Washington and Lee University — W. G. BEAN

Segments of Southern Thought. By Edd Winfield Parks. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1938. Pp. ix, 392. $3.00.)

The author who collects his scattered essays and publishes them in volume form subjects himself to a doubly rigid criticism, for the question immediately arises as to the need or desirability of reprinting what has already been given to the public. Such a miscellany is justified if the essays are too valuable to remain

hidden in inaccessible magazine files, if they achieve that rare distinction of style which makes a book of informal essays charming because of its very discursiveness, or if they are so closely related to each other that their real significance demands the continuity of a single volume. *Segments of Southern Thought* does not qualify under any of these headings. All but three of its seventeen chapters have been published within the last five years and are readily available in most libraries; and although some of them are very capably written, others suggest hasty composition, and none are really distinguished. As for the third point, the author hopes that "the consistency in philosophical outlook may give some unification to the diverse matters" about which he has written.

The introductory essay, "On Banishing Nonsense," sets forth this attitude in a somewhat naïve exposition of the humanist-agrarian—or "agrarian-distributist"—quarrel with standardization, scientific mechanization, and urbanization which has been filling the periodicals for the last decade. The author even hopes that this regional approach will justify the inclusion of the last two essays, "Eugene O'Neill's Symbolism" and "A Biographical Essay on George Borrow"—which occupy one fourth of the book, incidentally; otherwise, their inclusion is "traceable only to the author's whim." Since the reviewer finds them in no way germain to Southern thought, he will be indulged in a similar whim if he passes them by. Two others call for no consideration here, "Six Southern Novels" and "Mark Twain as Southerner," for they do not rise above the level of competent book reviewing, in spite of the extraordinary thesis of the latter that the "ordeal" of Clemens consisted in the fact that he was a transplanted Southerner.

Of the remaining twelve chapters, six are purely miscellaneous side lights on Southern life and literature, of varying merit. The biographical sketch of Richard Malcolm Johnston, now first published, probably owes its lack of interest chiefly to the dreary life and works of this minor local colorist from Georgia. On the other hand, "Frances Wright at Nashoba"—an account of the protégé of Jeremy Bentham who founded a short-lived Utopia in Tennessee, 1826-1830, for the philosophical as well as the physical emancipation of Negro slaves—is an amusing story, engagingly told. A third, printed in 1937 as a satisfactory introduction to the Black Cat Press edition of *Sut Lovingood Travels with Old Abe Lincoln,* certainly does not need reprinting so soon. Good or bad, at least none of these are strongly colored by the regional point of view. But "Walter Hines Page" and "Sawney Webb" are; here the author's philosophical springboard launches him in a timely and able plunge into the controversial waters of Old South vs. New South, and though he properly sinks the bloated reputation of Page, the literate Babbitt who blindly worshipped the New, he rescues a doubtful hero in the corpse of Webb, who clung like a barnacle to the Old as a classical schoolmaster in Tennessee. The reviewer, like most spectators who strive for objectivity, finds that as usual he is convinced by

the negative rather than the positive conclusions of academicians. The last essay in this group, "Southern Towns and Cities," is a well-written survey, although it served its purpose as such better in its original context as a chapter in the symposium, *Culture in the South* (1934); further, to one who has lived in several of these towns and cities, it has a Pathé-News quality that is more glib than convincing.

The remaining six essays are by far the best in the book, its only substantial segments of Southern thought. Four of them particularly (and they constitute one third of the book) hang together with a unity of design not to be found elsewhere in this miscellany. This is undoubtedly to be accounted for by the fact that they were written with a unity of purpose. "The Background of Southern Thought," "Southern Poetic Theory," and "Southern Poetry" originally formed the introduction to an anthology of *Southern Poets* (1936), and the fourth, "Legaré and Grayson," although published the next year as a separate article, should have been included in that introduction, for it overlaps and repeats as much as it supplements. In spite of this, and in spite of the fact that they all remain readily accessible in their original printing, these essays constitute the best running history of the subject yet written. Professor Parks has read widely in the Southern poets, both major and minor, and he has thought clearly and sanely about them. His judgments on their artistic achievements are usually sound and, what is better, original, although one feels that Poe and Lanier have been somewhat slighted because of their tendency to spill out of the Old South tradition—Poe as a sometime resident of New York and Lanier as a confused advocate of the New South. There are also occasional slips in biographical fact and literary history, but this is inevitable in the present state of research in the Southern field. But on the whole these four essays constitute a stimulating body of criticism and point the way, again, to the many monographs and biographies of Southern authors which must be written (and based on genuine scholarly research) before any articulation about Southern culture can become adequate. The fifth essay in this group, "Urban Influences on Ante-Bellum Writers," now first published, contains a mass of new and interesting information, but it is ineffective because badly fused. The final essay, "A Note on Southern Literature," is thesis-ridden: the South is not as fortunate as New England in that it did not communicate its way of life by translating it into an adequate literature for later generations; hence the need to find again that integration which we have lost, and only the agrarian-distributists are offering it to us. Seeing through these spectacles, the author places an extravagant estimate on the poetry and theories of Tate, Ransome, and Davidson, throughout these six best essays. But partisanship is not the weakness of this miscellaneous volume of somewhat misleadingly entitled *Segments of Southern Thought.*

Duke University CHARLES ANDERSON

Historical Scholarship in the United States, 1876-1901: As Revealed in the Correspondence of Herbert B. Adams. Edited by W. Stull Holt. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. Pp. 314. $2.50.)

From the extensive correspondence of Herbert Baxter Adams, the editor made a selection of 181 letters for the purpose of contributing to a "better understanding of historical scholarship in America during the most significant period of its development." Twenty-five of the letters were written by Adams himself; the remaining 156 by Frederick J. Turner, John S. Bassett, Woodrow Wilson, J. Franklin Jameson, and other former students of Adams at Johns Hopkins University, who were pioneering in the professional study, teaching and writing of "scientific" history, and by James Bryce, Daniel C. Gilman, James Schouler, Theodore Roosevelt, Walter Hines Page, Henry Adams, and others. If the achievement of his purpose is a criterion, the editor seems to have made a judicious selection of letters.

During the quarter century from Adams' appointment as a fellow in Johns Hopkins University in 1876 to his death in 1901, historical scholarship and writing became less and less the avocation of lawyers, clergymen, and business men, and more and more the profession of trained college and university professors; graduate instruction, the seminar method, and advanced degrees became firmly fixed as prerequisites for admission to the historical profession; the specialized monograph became the characteristic form of scholarly historical writing; history came to be regarded as a "science" as well as a branch of literature; and there was notable improvement in the quality and increase in the quantity of historical production. This unique collection of letters by professional historians, dealing with courses, students, texts, subjects of investigation, jobs, and other professional matters, is chiefly significant for its delineation of the establishment and spread of historical scholarship in the United States. Adams took great pleasure in the expanding colonial system of Johns Hopkins as represented on a wall map by pins stuck wherever a former student was teaching.

The correspondence shows definitely the pivotal position of Adams and Johns Hopkins University in American historical scholarship after 1876. It throws some light on the organization of the American Historical Association in 1884, the establishment of the *American Historical Review* in 1895, the planning of *The American Nation* as the first general history of the United States written by the young professional historians, the sensational launching in 1882 of the Johns Hopkins University *Studies in Historical and Political Science* as the first avenue in the United States for the publication of historical monographs, and the rise of Adams to national and even international distinction. Adams declined various offers of more lucrative professorships and administrative positions elsewhere. The letters confirm the general understanding that his claim to fame rests rather on his skill and success as administrator, organizer, editor, inspirer

of students, and promoter of systematic scholarship than on his research and writing.

Though Adams had studied for nearly three years in German universities, the letters show clearly that he esteemed French scholarship highly, that his respect for German scholarship was not unqualified, that he was in much closer contact with English than with German scholars, and that American scholars studying abroad were coming to the belief that German historical scholarship was hardly equal to that in American universities. Has the reputed dominant influence of German scholarship on American historians in the period been exaggerated?

The student of American history as well as historiography will find the Adams correspondence useful. In addition to data on Adams, other American historians, and the historical profession, the letters present interesting side lights on extension work, academic freedom, administrative procedures, and political interference in higher educational institutions.

Of especial interest to students of the South are the intellectual, political, and educational conditions described in letters of Adams and Lyon G. Tyler from Virginia, William P. Trent from the University of the South in Tennessee, John H. T. McPherson from the University of Georgia, and John S. Bassett from Trinity College in North Carolina. Trent, McPherson, and Bassett were irked by Southern intolerance, provincialism, and prejudice. Bassett, in disagreement with the prevailing ideas of his native North Carolina, wrote frankly and at length to his professor on the agrarian hostility to trusts, the absurdity of the Democratic charge of "Negro rule," the Red Shirt and White Supremacy campaigns of 1898 and 1900, and the Wilmington race riot of 1898 as orgies of racial passion and prejudice, and the suffrage amendment of 1900 as "an enamelled lie" and "one more step in the educating of our people that it is right to lie, to steal, & to defy all honesty in order to keep a certain party in power" (p. 265). Believing that the acquiescing Negro could not help himself, he suggested that Northern philanthropists might help the Negro by helping to educate the white man in Southern denominational colleges, for the "way to appeal to the Southerner is through his religion" (p. 261). He condemned the verdict awarded to Thomas Jefferson Gattis (incorrectly spelled "Gottis" on pp. 291-92) in his suit against President Kilgo of Trinity College for slander as a "political verdict" based on the prejudice of the jury against the Duke tobacco trust.

The editor has included a discriminating introduction, an adequate index, a list of the letters by date and correspondent, and a list of the letters by author to implement this volume of selected correspondence which will be a valuable source for students of American history and historiography.

University of North Carolina A. R. NEWSOME

Wider Horizons of American History, by Herbert E. Bolton. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1939. Pp. xv, 191. $1.50.)

This rather slender volume is composed of four essays delivered by Dr. Bolton before learned groups. These essays are specifically, "The Mission as a Frontier Institution" delivered in 1917, "Defensive Spanish Expansion and the Significance of the Borderlands," 1929, "The Epic of Greater America," 1932, and "The Black Robes of New Spain" delivered in 1934.

It is plain that this collection, covering almost twenty years of highly productive work, forms a valuable tracing of the growth and development of an idea The colonial history of the Southwest, once largely in the kindly but inexpert hands of clerical dilettantes, is now attracting the attention of an increasing body of vigorous researchers both lay and clerical.

From a wealth of material concerning the history of the Spanish Southwest, Dr. Bolton has distilled these essays. Their significance lies in that they call upon the historian to revise further the popular concept of the American frontier. Largely through the efforts of men such as R. G. Thwaites and the author of these essays it has become necessary to modify the Turner theory so sharply that it has virtually become a regional thesis applicable to only a relatively small section of the United States. The handful yet remaining, who defend the generalization that the American frontier was the product of the coonskin cap, corn liquor, and the old-time religion will find it difficult to fit Dr. Bolton's book into their scheme of things. He treats of a frontier that does not follow the pattern upon which the Turner thesis was created.

It should be gratifying to us to know that during the years in which the traditional Anglo-Saxon pioneer was rediscovering the territory to the east of the Mississippi, vacated by French and Spanish, Father Reyes could comment casually that in his California community "Mass is chanted with harps and violins," and Father Engelhardt could complain because "As an absolutely necessary means to win the souls of the savages, these unworldly men [missionaries] accepted the disagreeable task of conducting huge farms, teaching and supervising various mechanical trades, having an eye on the livestock and herders, and making ends meet generally." Such a plan of colonial conquest and such a scheme of civilization does not resemble the Eastern frontier.

While the cultural penetration of the Southwest by the Spanish is the central theme of these essays, Dr. Bolton points its significance by arguing with persuasive eloquence the doctrine of cultural interchange as a measure of ultimate civilization. It is difficult to avoid the implication that the Southwest would do well to cling to its Spanish heritage and absorb only such Anglo-Saxon culture as is necessary in the modern world.

The essays have further value in that they serve as testimony to the fact that while the ancient bonds binding literature to history have been sorely strained

in recent time, yet they are not entirely broken. The purist might complain that the author exhibits a flair for the theatrical, a complaint not without foundation.

Louisiana State University — EDWARD OTT

Black Folk, Then and Now: An Essay in the History and Sociology of the Negro Race. By W. E. Burghardt Du Bois. (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1939. Pp. xi, 401. Bibliography. $3.50.)

In the preface to this new book, Dr. Du Bois explains that for some six years he has been endeavoring to promote an encyclopedia of the Negro, but to date his efforts have not come to fruition. "Meantime," he says, "it has seemed to me not out of place to do again, and I hope somewhat more thoroughly, the task which I attempted twenty-three years ago in a little volume of the Home University Library, called *The Negro.* This book incorporates some of that former essay, but for the most part is an entirely new production and seeks to bring to notice the facts concerning the Negro. . . . I do not doubt that my Negro descent and narrow group culture have in many cases predisposed me to interpret my facts too favorably for my race" (pp. viii-ix).

Having been given this clear and candid statement of purpose and bias, the reader is prepared to find the author refuting with some heat the dictum of Guernier that "Alone among the continents Africa has no history." The Grimaldi-Negroids, (perhaps) the ancestors of the talented Cro-Magnons, masters of Europe in the later Aurignacian Age, were doubtless of African origin. The ancient Egyptians, if not exactly Negro in the narrower meaning of the word, were at least "Black Folk" (or certainly not white), and among them were definite Negro and Negroid elements, including a number of the Pharaohs. The valleys of the Niger and Congo as well as the Lakes and Cape regions have a long and rich, albeit relatively little known, history. The culture of the Africans embraced the industrial arts and handicrafts, agriculture, cattle raising, and statecraft which reached even in early times a stage far beyond merely tribal organizations. Enervating climate, invasions, and especially the slave trade, not only arrested but actually set back these flourishing cultures. Naturally Dr. Du Bois rejects as a reason for the backwardness of Negroid peoples the older idea of the innate inferiority of black people as compared with white or yellow. In doing so, he points out with justice that the weight of modern anthropological science supports his view.

In his chapters on the Negro in America, Dr. Du Bois condenses into smaller compass what he has written elsewhere—notably his recent book entitled *Black Reconstruction.* He has several chapters on the imperial penetration and partition of Africa by the various European states which have holdings in the vast continent. He shows how the government and industry of those colonies redound

to the benefit mainly of the whites while the blacks perform all or nearly all of the hard labor.

All this constitutes a challenge to the future of world democracy. In effect he poses the question: How can political democracy be transformed into industrial democracy (the logical next step in democratic development) even in the so-called "Great Democracies," so long as there persists among the white European and American workers a conviction that black folk are inherently inferior and hence are to be forever omitted from consideration in planning for the democracy of tomorrow? "The proletariat of the world," he says, "consists . . . overwhelmingly of the dark workers of Asia, Africa, the islands of the sea, and South and Central America. These are the ones who are supporting a superstructure of wealth, luxury, and extravagance. It is the rise of these people that is the rise of the world. The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line" (p. 383).

Altogether *Black Folk* is an arresting and thoughtful book and carries a message and a warning which white folk cannot afford to ignore.

Woman's College of the University of North Carolina B. B. KENDRICK

The Black Man in White America. By John G. Van Deusen. (Washington, D. C.: Associated Publishers, Inc., 1938. Pp. ix, 338. Bibliography. $3.25.)

This book is in happy contrast to the usual run of tomes touching the subject of race relations which issue from the pens of Negro authors. Professor Van Deusen's study is outstanding for its scholarliness, its scope, its saneness, and its attempt at fairness in dealing with highly controversial subjects. It seeks to avoid extremes in consideration of all angles of the Negro problem. The author launches his study with a discussion of "Race Inferiority." In this initial chapter he sets forth many of the inconveniences and injustices suffered by Negroes in regard to education, recreation, travel, health, housing, and administration of the law. In subsequent chapters he elaborates these subjects and introduces many new ones. The unhappy condition of the Negro farmer is set forth in vivid terms. Cases of peonage are cited and decried. But the author does not attribute all the woes of the colored farmers to grasping white overlords. Indolence, instability, and thriftlessness on the part of the Negroes are frankly admitted as contributing greatly to their plight. The city wage earner is pictured as being little better off than the farmer. His work is apt to be irregular; his wages are low; his hours are long; his tenure is precarious; his vocations are restricted to less desirable pursuits. In all respects his status compares unfavorably with that of white men engaged in similar activities.

In recent years great numbers of Negroes have left the Republican party to vote with the Democrats. In many instances, as Professor Van Deusen points out, they have profited by the change. But, according to the author, the New

Deal has proven disastrous to Negroes in many ways. The government's crop reducing program resulted in the eviction of many Negro farmers and the lion's share of the benefit payments went to the white landlords. If Negroes attempted to get relief jobs they met discrimination in regard to both work and wages. Those in industrial pursuits profited little from the various attempts to secure collective bargaining and wage-hour regulations. In fact, the author terms the Negro "The Forgotten Man of the New Deal," and New Deal measures are referred to as schemes which, as far as the Negro is concerned "go 'round and around' and come out nowhere" (p. 122).

The author has stimulating chapters on the Negro criminal, the mob, the public school, the Negro college, the Negro church, the Negro press, Negro leadership, and the Negro's contribution to literature and to art. Most interesting is the discussion of the Negro and his songs. Samples are given of various types of Negro tunes and these are followed by lucid interpretive comments.

The readability of the book is impaired considerably by a piling up of statistics, and this in spite of a professed contempt for figures:

> Figures must be
> Properly compiled,
> Adequately presented,
> Thoughtfully interpreted,
> And even then they lie like hell (p. 130).

Occasionally the narrative is brightened, however, by spicy phrases. For example, in evaluating the New Deal's slum clearance project for Negroes, the author says: "But no matter how you slice it, it's still baloney" (p. 121). And again, in discussing the Scottsboro episode, he says: "In the first trial the district attorney waved Victoria Price's cotton underwear in the air demanding that the jury convict the Negroes and 'defend Southern womanhood.' In the fourth trial he was still flourishing the undergarments (though they had now mysteriously changed to silk) and calling on the jury to burn the accused as a rebuke to . . . Jew money supporting the defense" (pp. 134-35).

The author concludes that "there is no immediate solution for the Negro problem." He disapproves radical programs such as those suggested by Du Bois' *Crisis* and Randolph's *Messenger*. He sets forth as "a reasonable goal toward which to work" the following program: "the cessation of economic exploitation, proper living conditions in cities, the end of lynching, a guarantee of justice in the courts, provision for better educational facilities, and the right to vote, subject to an educational qualification honestly administered" (p. 296). The solution of the Negro problem, he says, calls for patience on the part of both races and a solution can come only through education and understanding.

University of Mississippi B. I. WILEY

Black Workers and the New Unions. By Horace R. Cayton and George S. Mitchell. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. xviii, 473. Bibliography, tables, and appendixes. $4.00.)

Two social scientists have examined in a scholarly and practical way the problem of Negro labor in the light of history and in relation to white labor, North and South, under the impact of the New Deal, with respect to the three basic industries of iron and steel, meat-packing, and railroad car shops. Their study is based upon nine hundred interviews with workers, plant managers, foremen, and union leaders, and is supported by valuable statistical information. It is the third in a series of studies projected in 1933 by a special Committee on Negroes in the Economic Reconstruction. The first was *The Collapse of Cotton Tenancy,* by Charles S. Johnson, Edwin R. Embree, and W. W. Alexander, published in 1935; the second, *A Preface to Peasantry,* by Arthur F. Raper, was published in 1936. *Black Workers and the New Unions* has a foreword by Charles S. Johnson.

The Cayton-Mitchell study, although essentially a social and economic survey of current trends, is, in a sketchy sense, an excursion into Southern history, for Negro labor is largely in the South or has largely come out of the South. One section of the book is given over to the Birmingham district, with attention to historical background. The authors frankly find that upper-class Negroes, including members of the professions, have been pretty generally antagonistic to the labor union movement, partly as a result of the historic rivalry between slaves and "poor whites," partly because, in former days of unionism, there was a strong tendency by white workers to keep Negroes out of unions and otherwise exploit them. The Negroes preferred exploitation by white employers to exploitation by white employees who wished to keep them out of industry. This situation in the labor front tended to give employers the advantageous position of being able to "divide and rule." But, particularly since the vogue of the New Deal, Negroes have come into labor unions in substantial numbers, and there are labor leaders of both races who see their duty as that of bringing together white and colored workers whom capitalists have attempted to keep apart.

Radical activities within the labor movement in different sections are treated with objectivity, both as a militant influence and as a red herring used by anti-union employers. It is pointed out that the present Negro leadership will not likely encourage Negro workers to fight against capitalistic interests.

This book of solid information also contains an important recommendation. The authors urge that there be a Negro liaison organization in the field of labor relations, somewhat after the manner of the United Hebrew Trades. Such a Negro establishment could organize the unorganized in co-operation with existing unions, serve as a channel of information, protect Negroes against discrimi-

nation, and seek to break down white workers' prejudices against Negroes. The work is a balance between diagnosis and proposed remedy. It is a good study on the South and on the Negro, and it is fair, factual, and timely.

University of Missouri H. CLARENCE NIXON

Forty Acres and Steel Mules. By Herman C. Nixon. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938. Pp. viii, 98. Bibliography, illustrations. $2.50.)

In physical appearance the book is like an elementary school geography. This style of format was apparently chosen to provide room for a great number of photographs obtained from the Division of Information of the Farm Security Administration. Besides its 97 pages of print the book contains 32 pages of pictures, illustrating in the main poverty, squalor, and quaint conditions. Whether only this sort of pictures was obtainable from the collection used or the author chose to use only this kind, the net result tends to distort perspective. For example, the shabby schoolhouses on page 83 would compare sadly with most of the schoolhouses in the rural and village South.

The title of the work leads one to expect a study of the so-called "one-horse" farmer in relation to mechanized and large-scale farming, but it deals with a multitude of phases of Southern rural and urban life. It is another book in the rapidly expanding volume of literature dealing with the ills of the South. The study is not history but as the author himself says, "It is an attempt to interpret the rural South and the village South in the light of the inevitable trends of the time." There is little new to those who, with open eyes, have grown up in the environment discussed. The South is being much thumped and probed by the social pathologists. Unfortunately the doctors are much more effective in diagnosis than therapeutics. The good diagnostician, however, investigates carefully the history of his case. Historian himself, Dr. Nixon has generally avoided the historical approach, except in Chapter IV, which is the best chapter in the book. He did not follow his own prescription. Referring to the attack of two groups on the AAA (p. 18) for the plight of the cotton tenants, he says they criticized without seeing the problem as a whole and in historical perspective. "It must be remembered that the ills of tenancy are cumulative, compounded of many causes, and accompanied by other ills." No analysis of Southern life can be wholly satisfying and no solution for the grave social and economic problems of the South is likely to be found which ignores the historical background.

The style of the book is, generally speaking, simple, clear, and vivid. There are, however, some involved sentences and the discussion is interlarded here and there with slang phrases and sophisticated economic parlance. There are occasional slips, like "free gift" (p. 11).

nation, and seek to break down white workers' prejudices against Negroes. The work is a balance between diagnosis and proposed remedy. It is a good study on the South and on the Negro, and it is fair, factual, and timely.

University of Missouri H. CLARENCE NIXON

Forty Acres and Steel Mules. By Herman C. Nixon. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938. Pp. viii, 98. Bibliography, illustrations. $2.50.)

In physical appearance the book is like an elementary school geography. This style of format was apparently chosen to provide room for a great number of photographs obtained from the Division of Information of the Farm Security Administration. Besides its 97 pages of print the book contains 32 pages of pictures, illustrating in the main poverty, squalor, and quaint conditions. Whether only this sort of pictures was obtainable from the collection used or the author chose to use only this kind, the net result tends to distort perspective. For example, the shabby schoolhouses on page 83 would compare sadly with most of the schoolhouses in the rural and village South.

The title of the work leads one to expect a study of the so-called "one-horse" farmer in relation to mechanized and large-scale farming, but it deals with a multitude of phases of Southern rural and urban life. It is another book in the rapidly expanding volume of literature dealing with the ills of the South. The study is not history but as the author himself says, "It is an attempt to interpret the rural South and the village South in the light of the inevitable trends of the time." There is little new to those who, with open eyes, have grown up in the environment discussed. The South is being much thumped and probed by the social pathologists. Unfortunately the doctors are much more effective in diagnosis than therapeutics. The good diagnostician, however, investigates carefully the history of his case. Historian himself, Dr. Nixon has generally avoided the historical approach, except in Chapter IV, which is the best chapter in the book. He did not follow his own prescription. Referring to the attack of two groups on the AAA (p. 18) for the plight of the cotton tenants, he says they criticized without seeing the problem as a whole and in historical perspective. "It must be remembered that the ills of tenancy are cumulative, compounded of many causes, and accompanied by other ills." No analysis of Southern life can be wholly satisfying and no solution for the grave social and economic problems of the South is likely to be found which ignores the historical background.

The style of the book is, generally speaking, simple, clear, and vivid. There are, however, some involved sentences and the discussion is interlarded here and there with slang phrases and sophisticated economic parlance. There are occasional slips, like "free gift" (p. 11).

Geographic influences, farm tenancy, towns and villages, merchants and markets, and local industries are discussed with understanding, cleverness, and clarity. There are some mistakes and misleading statements, which almost inevitably occur in brief general discussions. An industrial expansion in the South between 1850 and 1860 is mentioned (p. 50), but the total value of manufactured products in the South in 1860 was less than that of 1850. Many will be surprised at the statement (p. 20) that social democracy was one of the major issues of Reconstruction. The connection between the Civil War and Reconstruction and the baneful crop-lien system is not emphasized and the hindrance of the system to progressive agriculture and to co-operation among the farmers in the past and present is barely recognized. Likewise protective tariffs, rate discriminations, and the financial drain of outside capital upon every phase of business in the South are not sufficiently emphasized as factors in the "colonial economy," or economic bondage of the South. Nor is the cotton control program of the New Deal mentioned as a factor in the loss of foreign markets for cotton (p. 91). The crop-lien system was more than a "best bid for credit" after Reconstruction (p. 20), it was a necessity. The supply merchant emphasized cotton planting not merely to procure more business but as the best available security for his "advances." The Negro couplet, quoted on page 21, is extravagant, although the Negro was often exploited. Many persons go barefooted in summer not because of poverty but for comfort (p. 13), and the inflow of outsiders into the South is not mentioned in the discussion (p. 10) of the frightful loss to the South by the exodus of its own people. The book is somewhat marred by the author's evident sympathy for the underdog, white or black, and a prejudice against landlords and business men on "Main Street" who "know how to live on the labors of others."

Dr. Nixon not only attempts diagnosis but he also points to certain lines of treatment without being venturesomely specific. To be sure he does not tell us what is to become of the great body of small farmers and tenants who will find it impossible, he believes, to compete in staple production with mechanized and capitalistic farming, nor what is to be done with those who should be removed from submarginal lands. He approves, of course, scientific agriculture, including a scientific use of lands, soil husbandry, reforestation, organization of laborers and tenants with state aid and ballots for all, black apparently as well as white, and recommends land reforms so as to have a general situation of "farms for farmers," as in European countries. He advocates "villages for villagers," a revival of old-fashioned community spirit and co-operation, in spite of modern conditions that militate against it, with government aid and action. He strikes a strong note for social planning with the aid of state and national government. The TVA is endorsed as a great scheme of social planning, "the strongest card in the New Deal." The book closes with a discussion of the "South's Role in the Nation."

As one whose experience with farming and farmers is quite as extensive as the author's, and who has had a large experience with sawmilling besides, I should like to add to Dr. Nixon's statement of the causes of the farmers' woes the fact that the farmers themselves are to blame for much of their troubles. The author is probably correct in his view that small farmers and "tenants are largely victims of a social rather than a biological heritage," but inertia, lack of initiative and planning, the habit of idleness, and slipshod methods of farm management, together with the inescapable hazards of farming, are basic factors in farm poverty. No manner of governmental paternalism and regimentation will solve the farmers' problems as long as these conditions last.

While *Forty Acres and Steel Mules* has its imperfections and contains views that will be challenged by many competent persons, it has the merit of being vivid, interesting, and thought-provoking. It could not have been written except by one who has been an alert firsthand observer, and a zealous student for many years of the complicated problems discussed. It is well worth a careful reading.

University of Alabama ALBERT B. MOORE

Caldwell and Company: A Southern Financial Empire. By John Berry McFerrin. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. x, 284. Bibliography, appendixes. $3.50.)

In early November, 1930, a financial storm struck with full force over the banking house of Caldwell and Company; almost immediately the entire South was brought to the sudden realization that its financial structure was shaken to its very foundations. Originally created to help Southern communities in the sale of their bonds, Caldwell and Company was destined to bring about an intensification of the depression in the South. The company was chartered in 1917 by Rogers Caldwell in Nashville, Tennessee, as a small underwriter and distributor of municipal bonds. It was sufficiently well established by the end of the World War to take advantage of the general prosperity and the rapid industrialization, urbanization, and road building in the South.

From the very beginning Caldwell allowed his company to be carried along in the general trend of investment banking toward the disastrous collapse. By 1925 Caldwell and Company was the largest bond house in the South, and from 1926 to 1929 it was regarded as the outstanding factor in the whole economic structure of that section. Its ramifications reached beyond financial and commercial enterprise into politics. Prudence was considered axiomatic of profit; queasy doubts disappeared. Technicalities were lost in the fog of subsidiary corporations. All the new fields that were entered were taken over primarily to increase prestige and profit. Haphazard internal accounting, infrequent audits, a disregard for traditional and standard safeguards made the company's practices more dangerously unsound and illegal. The "Morgan of

the South" continually indulged in all the types of legal chicanery and shrouded financial policy that the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency with Ferdinand Pecora as counsel discovered among the "bigger fry" in 1933-1934.

After desperate negotiations with BankoKentucky, Caldwell and Company were unable to meet their commitments. Liquidation left the Caldwell interests only the comparatively unimportant Apex Oil Company as a business re-entry. Rogers Caldwell and his father became legal owners of its controlling stock in 1937 and took over the management of this organization. But apparently the habit of engaging in flighty ventures was not forgotten for, since Professor McFerrin's volume has been released, a Chancery Court suit charging the Caldwell family group with mismanagement and the transferring of Apex assets "illegally and improperly to dummy corporations owned and controlled" by them was announced on August 19, 1939. The Barge Oil Company, the Superior Corporation, the Ferrolene Sales Corporation, and the Red Ace Petroleum Company, Incorporated, were listed as defendants and were charged with serving as the dummy corporations.

In studying the rise and fall of this financial organization and its political triumvirate, Dr. McFerrin has endeavored to "portray against the background of Southern economic development during the 20's the history of an enterprise whose remarkably rapid growth and tragic collapse constitute a unique episode in Southern finance" (p. vii). His treatise is thoughtful, critical, and analytical. Devoid of loud muckraking terms, Dr. McFerrin draws strong indictments from reasoned conclusions. In respect to the company's public obligations, he concludes: "Caldwell and Company can be justly charged with violating sound business ethics, assuming such to exist, in at least two respects: namely, first, actual violation of law; and second, carrying through those transactions which, while technically within the law, were of such a nature that they should clearly be outside the code of business morals" (p. 249). On the political activity of Colonel Luke Lea, Rogers Caldwell, and the state administration the author pronounces condemnation. In connection with the failure of impeachment proceedings against the Governor of Tennessee, he writes: "If civil units are ever to obtain good government they must take action against those officials who are derelict in the performance of their duties and Governor Horton certainly was in this class" (pp. 203-204).

Dr. McFerrin has woven elusive and unusual source material into a well-written history of every aspect of this complex financial house. Failing as a business unit, it also failed as a contributor to Southern development. This must be considered not as an indication that the South is unable to help solve its own problems but as an indictment of unrestrained license in the business world itself.

University of Chattanooga JAMES W. LIVINGOOD

COMMUNICATION

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, WASHINGTON

August 10, 1939

Dr. Wendell H. Stephenson
Managing Editor, The Journal of Southern History
University, Louisiana

Dear Dr. Stephenson:

Without any criticism of Professor W. F. Craven's scholarly review of H. C. Forman's *Jamestown and St. Mary's, Buried Cities of Romance,* which appeared in the August issue of the *Journal of Southern History,* pages 390-92, may we correct an impression which it is possible some people may receive concerning our plans for the Jamestown portion of Colonial National Historical Park, Virginia.

Mr. Forman is no longer connected with the Jamestown archeological project and his "encouragement of further attempts to reconstruct lost colonial buildings" is not inspired by the National Park Service plan for the Jamestown area. The National Park Service has not yet reconstructed any of the lost buildings on Jamestown Island and does not plan to reconstruct any of them. Possible exception might be made if original building plans, or other detailed and indubitable evidence concerning the physical appearance and construction of these buildings should come to light, but that is not probable.

The Jamestown project is, and is expected to remain, primarily an archeological project. If preservatives for 17th century brick can be found, the streets, walks, and foundations discovered by the archeologist may be exposed to the view of the public much as is done in Italy at Pompeii. Otherwise, the 17th century City of Jamestown will be envisioned in the Jamestown archeological laboratory and museum, where a wealth of architectural data and artifact material of all description lays bare the architectural, social, and technological history of the pioneer Virginian at his capital, 1607-1699.

Sincerely yours,

RONALD F. LEE
Supervisor of Historic Sites

Historical News and Notices

As announced in the August issue of the *Journal,* the fifth annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association will convene in Lexington, Kentucky, on Thursday afternoon, November 2, and continue in session until Saturday noon, November 4. Headquarters will be at the Lafayette Hotel. Thomas D. Clark of the University of Kentucky, co-chairman of the local arrangements committee, announces a complimentary luncheon, a complimentary dinner, and a reception at the home of President and Mrs. Frank L. McVey. Professor Clark is also arranging an auto tour of Lexington and the adjacent Bluegrass region, "without any cost whatever to members of the Association." He will appreciate advance information as to the number desiring to make the trip. The Filson Club, the Kentucky State Historical Society, and the Bradford Club are co-operating in planning for the meeting, and the Thursday evening dinner will be a joint session of the several societies.

Personal

Miss Blanche Henry Clark, who recently received the doctorate in history at Vanderbilt University, has been appointed dean of women and assistant professor of history at Transylvania College. She was formerly connected with Ward Belmont Junior College at Nashville.

Thomas P. Govan has resigned his position at the University of Chattanooga to become professor of history at the University of the South.

Fletcher M. Green of the University of North Carolina will be on Kenan leave for the fall quarter of the current academic year.

Announcement has been made of the appointment of Robert D. Meade as professor of history and head of the department at Randolph-Macon College. He replaces Dr. B. W. Arnold, who retired last year. Dr. Meade became associate professor of history at Randolph-Macon in 1936.

Joshua Coffin Chase, president of the Florida Historical Society from 1935 to 1939, has been elected director of the Camden, Maine, Historical Society.

Chase C. Mooney has been appointed professor of history and political science at Brenau College.

Summer research activities of members of the Davidson College faculty: J. A. McGeachy spent the summer in research at the University of Chicago; Frontis W. Johnston, who is working upon a biography of Zebulon B. Vance, utilized the latter part of the summer in research among the Vance Papers in the archives of the North Carolina Historical Commission; and W. P. Cumming of the English department continued his study of early Carolina cartography.

E. Merton Coulter of the University of Georgia taught at the University of Chicago during the second summer session, after which he visited Central America.

The following appointments and promotions have been made in North Carolina colleges and universities: Richard L. Watson, Jr., of Yale University has been appointed instructor in history at Duke University; Percival Perry has been appointed part-time instructor in history at Wake Forest College, replacing Henry S. Stroupe, who is at Duke University doing graduate work; and George Bauerlein of North Carolina State College has been promoted assistant professor of history.

Charles Dykstra, formerly a graduate assistant at Louisiana State University, has been appointed professor of history and government at Sterling College.

The Social Science Research Council has announced the following Southern grant-in-aid appointees for 1939-1940: Wilfrid H. Callcott, University of South Carolina, Caribbean policy of the United States, 1890-1920; Earl F. Cruickshank, Vanderbilt University, European imperialism in Northwestern Africa, 1875-1895; Thomas P. Govan, University of Chattanooga, credit system and cotton trade in the Old South; Shelby T. McCloy, Duke University, government assistance in eighteenth century France; Daniel M. Robison, Vanderbilt University, the Whig tradition in the Solid South; and Austin L. Venable, University of Arkansas, the public career of William L. Yancey. Other grant-in-aid appointments to members of the historical guild for work on subjects of interest to students of Southern history: Abbot E. Smith, Bard College, Columbia University, indentured servants and redemptioners in the American colonies; and Vertrees J. Wyckoff, St. John's College, economic history of Maryland during the seventeenth century. Predoctoral field fellowships were granted to Richard M. Carrigan, Princeton University, social and economic conditions of South Carolina; and Seth Hammond, Harvard University, problems of the United States cotton industry, 1910-1937.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

The Mississippi Department of Archives and History has recently acquired 100 issues of the weekly Columbus *Patron of Husbandry,* May 3, 1879-January 20, 1883; and, as a gift from John Wendell Bailey of the University of Richmond, 50 issues of the bimonthly Winona *Baptist Layman,* September 1, 1894-October 8, 1896; 366 issues of the weekly Jackson *Record,* November 16, 1898-January 4, 1906; and 321 issues of the weekly Jackson *Baptist Record,* January 11, 1906-February 29, 1912.

Several tons of records from Washington and Ottawa counties have been acquired by the Oklahoma Historical Society, through the co-operation of the Historical Records Survey.

The Virginia Historical Society has received as gifts many letters and records dating from the latter part of the seventeenth century; wills and other manuscripts relating to the Grinnan, Bryan, and Urquhart families; a copy of the Trumbell portrait of George Wythe in Independence Hall, painted and presented by Mrs. Olaf Saugstad; a portrait of George Washington by Charles Peale Polk; and a counterpane 165 years old owned by the mother of John Randolph of Roanoke.

R. S. Cotterill of Florida State College for Women is the author of *A Short History of the Americas* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1939, pp. xviii, 459, $2.50). The purpose of the volume is "to give the student a general acquaintance with the entire field of American history and at the same time to supply sufficient information to serve as a foundation for advanced work in national or regional fields."

The past decade has witnessed the publication of sundry centennial histories of institutions of higher learning in the South. One of these, Dorothy L. Gilbert, *Guilford, A Quaker College* (Guilford College, N. C., 1937, pp. 359), escaped the *Journal's* attention until too late to be reviewed. The work is a valuable contribution to the growing literature on educational institutions in the South.

The Negro in Brazil, by Arthur Ramos, translated from the Portuguese by Richard Pattie (Washington, D. C.: The Associated Publishers, Inc., 1939, pp. xx, 203), considers the slave trade and slavery, slave insurrections, the abolitionist movement, the cultural heritage of the Brazilian Negro, and the Negro in art, music, literature, science, war, and politics.

The United States Department of Agriculture Library has recently issued several bibliographical contributions, compiled by Everett E. Edwards, Agricultural Economist, Bureau of Agricultural Economics: No. 33 (September, 1938),

"References on American Colonial Agriculture"; No. 34 (January, 1939), "References on Agriculture in the Life of the Nation"; No. 26 (Edition 2, January, 1939), "Selected References on the History of Agriculture in the United States"; No. 25 (Edition 2, April, 1939), "References on the Significance of the Frontier in American History"; and No. 27 (Edition 2, April, 1939), "A List of American Economic Histories."

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"Booksellers and Circulating Libraries in Colonial Maryland," by Joseph T. Wheeler, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (June).

"Jeb Stuart in Maryland, June, 1863," by George C. Keidel, *ibid.*

"A Note on the Minutes of the House of Delegates, February 10-March 13, 1777," by Elizabeth W. Meade, *ibid.*

"Roger Brooke Taney and the Tenets of Democracy," by Carl B. Swisher, *ibid.* (September).

"Wenlocke Christison's Plantation, 'The Ending of Controversie,'" by Henry C. Forman, *ibid.*

"Thomas Bray and the Maryland Parochial Libraries," by Joseph T. Wheeler, *ibid.*

"Ships and Shipping of Seventeenth Century Maryland," continued, by V. J. Wychoff, *ibid.*

"Lord Dunmore and the Pennsylvania-Virginia Boundary Dispute," by Percy B. Caley, in the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* (June).

"Captain John Smith's Attitudes toward the Indians," by William Randel, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (July).

"Red House, Rockbridge County, Virginia," by Francis Lee Thurman, *ibid.*

"Career of Col. Charles Broadwater, Fairfax County, Va.," by Robert Lee Haycock, *ibid.*

"Salvaging Revolutionary Relics from the York River," by Homer L. Ferguson, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (July).

"The First Colonial Grammar in English," by Grace Warren Landrum, *ibid.*

"Cedar Creek Monthly Meeting and Its Meeting House," by Mrs. Douglas Summers Brown, *ibid.*

"The Proprietors of Richmond's New Theatre of 1819," by Martin Staples Shockley, *ibid.*

"The Colonial Churches of Gloucester County, Virginia," by George C. Mason, *ibid.*

"Zeta at Historic Hampden-Sydney, 1850-1912," by Karl W. Fisher, in *Beta Theta Pi* (February, March).

"The Career of Montfort Stokes in North Carolina," by William O. Foster, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July).

"The Establishment of the North Carolina College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts," by David A. Lockmiller, *ibid.*

"Economic Conditions in North Carolina about 1780," II, by Francis G. Morris and Phyllis M. Morris, *ibid.*

"The Whigs in the Politics of the Confederacy," by Daniel M. Robison, in the East Tennessee Historical Society's *Publications* (1939).

"Cherokee Removal, An Unnecessary Tragedy," by John P. Brown, *ibid.*

"James K. Polk and the 'Immortal Thirteen,'" by Powell Moore, *ibid.*

"Branch Banking in Tennessee Prior to the Civil War," by Claude A. Campbell, *ibid.*

"The Freedman's Bureau in Tennessee," by Weymouth T. Jordan, *ibid.*

"John Mason Brown, 1837-1890," by Preston Brown, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (July).

"Walker Daniel, the Founder of Danville," by Calvin M. Fackler, *ibid.*

"Some Early Connections between Kentucky and Tennessee," by Alfred L. Crabb, *ibid.*

"Kentucky History in Old Depositions: Washington County, Ky.," by Orval W. Baylor, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (July).

"The Kentucky Gazette Reports the French Revolution," by Huntley Dupre, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (September).

"Missouri as a Pioneer in Criminal Court Reform," by A. C. Breckenridge and W. G. Colman, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (July).

"Educational Opportunities in Early Missouri," II, by Margaret McMillan and Monia Cook Morris, *ibid.*

"Chief Thomas Mitchell Buffington and Chief William Charles Rogers," by John Bartlett Meserve, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (June).

"Fort Davis," by Grant Foreman, *ibid.*

"Pawnee Traditions and Customs," by Guy Rowley Moore, *ibid.*

"Francis Bartow Fite, M. D.," by LeRoy Long, *ibid.*

"New Springplace," by Vinson Lackey, *ibid.*

"Early Grady County History," by Meta C. Sager, *ibid.*

"Samuel Thomas Bledsoe," by M. L. Lyles, *ibid.*

"A Story of Choctaw Chiefs," continued, by Peter James Hudson, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"Audubon and His Baltimore Patrons," by Robinson C. Watters, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (June).

"Robert Mills and the Washington Monument in Baltimore," edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr., *ibid.*

"Logs and Papers of Baltimore Privateers, 1812-15," edited by *id.*, *ibid.*

"Letters of Charles Carrol, Barrister," continued, *ibid.*

"Autobiography of Commodore George N. Hollins," *ibid.* (September).

"Charles Carroll of Carrollton's Letter Describing the Battle of Baltimore," contributed by W. Stull Holt, *ibid.*

"Baltimore County Land Records of 1686," contributed by Louis Dow Scisco, *ibid.*

"Evidences Relating to Westover," in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (July).

"The First American Tribute to Lafayette in 1824," edited by Lester J. Cappon, *ibid.*

"Letters from Old Trunks: From Coles Collection of Preston Papers," *ibid.*

"Notes from the Records of Stafford County, Virginia, Order Books," continued, *ibid.*

"A Shorthand Diary of William Byrd of Westover," by Louis B. Wright, in the *Huntington Library Quarterly* (July).

"The Colonial Court Records of Lower Norfolk and Norfolk Counties," edited by Marshall W. Butt, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (July).

"Amherst County Chancery Suits," edited by Lenora Higginbotham Sweeny, *ibid.*

"Documents Relating to the Early History of the College of William and Mary and to the History of the Church in Virginia," contributed by Herbert L. Ganter, *ibid.*

"Notes from Surry County Records which Relate to the College Plantation," contributed by Mrs. Victor W. Stewart, *ibid.*

"Notes from Amelia County Records which Relate to its Courthouse," contributed by W. S. Morton, *ibid.*

"Unpublished Letters from North Carolinians to Polk," continued, edited by Elizabeth Gregory McPherson, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July).

"The 'J. Hartsell Memora': The Journal of a Tennessee Captain in the War of 1812," edited by Mary Hardin McCown, in the East Tennessee Historical Society's *Publications* (1939).

"Marriage Notices Appearing in Knoxville Newspapers, 1791-1813," compiled by Carrie C. Deming and Laura E. Luttrell, *ibid.*

"Writings on Tennessee History, 1938," compiled by Laura E. Luttrell, *ibid.*

"John D. Shane's Interview with Mrs. John McKinney," edited by Otto A. Rothert, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (July).

"Early Marriage Records of Madison County, Kentucky," compiled by W. Rodes Shackelford, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (July).

"Mercer County, Kentucky: Abstracts of Wills, Books 5 and 6," contributed by Marie Menaugh, *ibid.*

"Kentucky Marriages and Obituaries," continued, compiled and edited by G. Glenn Clift, *ibid.*

"Bourbon Circuit Court Records, Suits in Abstract," by Julia Spencer Ardery, *ibid.*

"Captain John Fowler of Kentucky and Virginia: Chronology," compiled by Mrs. W. T. Fowler, *ibid.*

"Letters of George Caleb Bingham to James S. Rollins," VIII, edited by C. B. Rollins, in the *Missouri Hisorical Review* (July).

"Reconnoissance of H. L. Marvin, Chief Engineer for the Kansas Southern Railroad in 1884," edited by James W. Moffitt, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (June).

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"John Wesley's Georgia Ministry," by Edgar L. Pennington, in *Church History,* (September).

"Georgia and the South," by Avery Craven, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (September).

"Mulberry Grove in Colonial Times," by Savannah Unit, Federal Writers' Project, *ibid.*

"Two Years at Fort Bartow, 1862-1864," by Rogers W. Young, *ibid.*

"Atlanta After Forty-Two Years," by Joseph Johnson, in the *Atlanta Historical Bulletin* (April).

"Captain John Keely: An Informal Reminiscence," by Ella May Thornton, *ibid.*

"Sue Harper Mims, C. S. B.," by Carolyn Cobb, *ibid.*

"Development of the Library in Atlanta," by Alma Hill Jamison, *ibid.*

"Judges of the Superior Courts of Fulton and De Kalb Counties," by John D. Humphries, *ibid.*

"James Alexander Robertson," by A. Curtis Wilgus, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (July).

"Why Two Connecticut Yankees Went South," by Samuel H. Fisher, *ibid.*

"Materials Relating to British East Florida," by Charles L. Mowat, *ibid.*

"The Federal Writers' Project in Mississippi," by Eri Douglass, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (April).

"The Historical Records Survey in Mississippi," by Percy L. Rainwater, *ibid.*

"The Natchez Trace: A Federal Highway in the Old Southwest," by Lena Mitchell Jamison, *ibid.*

"Gaines Trace in Monroe County, Mississippi," by W. A. Evans, *ibid.*

"Gaines Trace through Eastern Clay County, Mississippi," by Arthur Dugan and J. H. Ervin, *ibid.*

"Life in New Orleans in the Spanish Period," by Minter Wood, in the *Louisiana Hisorical Quarterly* (July).

"The Relations between New Orleans and Latin America, 1810-1824," by Alfred T. Wellborn, *ibid.*

"Blood on the Banquette," by John S. Kendall, *ibid.*

"General Banks and the Radicals," by Harry Williams, in the *New England Quarterly* (June).

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"Items Relating to Charles Town, S. C., from the Boston News-Letter," contributed by Mrs. Waveland FitzSimmons, annotated by Theodore D. Jervey, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).

"The Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1765-1775," continued, contributed by Mabel L. Webber, copied by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*

"Dr. James Lynah, A Surgeon of the Revolution," annotated by A. S. Salley, *ibid.*

"Journal of Gen. Peter Horry," *id., ibid.*

"Letters of Barnett Hardeman Cody and Others, 1861-1864," I, contributed, with notes, by Edmund Cody Burnett, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (September).

"Papers Relating to the Georgia-Florida Frontier, 1784-1800," XII, edited and translated by D. C. Corbitt, *ibid.*

"Old Canoochee Backwoods Sketches," VII, by Julia E. Harn, *ibid.*

"De Kalb County Marriages, 1850," compiled by Franklin M. Garrett, in the *Atlanta Historical Bulletin* (April).

"The St. Augustine Census of 1786," translated and edited by Joseph B. Lockey, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (July).

"The Panton, Leslie Papers: Continuing the Letters of Edmund Doyle, Trader," *ibid.*

"Mathew Andrew Dunn Letters," edited by Weymouth T. Jordan, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (April).

"A Murder Case Tried in New Orleans in 1773," edited by Henry P. Dart, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (July).

"Louis Declouet's Memorial to the Spanish Government, December 7, 1814," edited by Stanley Faye, *ibid.*

"Records of the Superior Council of Louisiana, August-September, 1853," LXXX, by Heloise H. Cruzat, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*

"Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana, December, 1783," LXII, by Laura L. Porteous, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES AND COMPILATIONS

"The Fate of Confederate Archives," by Dallas T. Irvine, in the *American Historical Review* (July).

"Revolt Among Historians: Interpretations in Historiography," by Walter E. Bean, in the *Sewanee Review* (July-September).

"The Higher Law Controversy," by Frederick E. Welfle, in *Mid-America* (July).
"Tonti Letters," edited by Jean Delanglez, *ibid.*
"The Mississippi Valley and Its History," by William O. Lynch, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (June).
"British Versus German Traditions in Colonial Agriculture," by Richard H. Shryock, *ibid.*
"The Archives of the United States: A Documentary History," by Percy S. Flippin, *ibid.*
"The Richard H. Mockett Diary," edited by James L. Sellers, *ibid.* (September).
"Frances Wright's Experiment with Negro Emancipation," in the *Indiana Magazine of History* (June).
"A Southern Journey," by William O. Lynch, *ibid.*

RESEARCH PROJECTS IN SOUTHERN HISTORY
FIRST ANNUAL SUPPLEMENT

Compiled by FRED COLE

This continuation of the list of research projects begun in the November, 1938, issue of the *Journal* follows the form of the first compilation. Some doctoral dissertations have been included that were previously listed either in the *Journal* compilation or the Carnegie Institution *List of Doctoral Dissertations Now in Progress at American Universities, December 1938,* that their status may be noted.

The arrangement is chronological under subject headings except for the alphabetical order of "Biographical" studies. The progress of the project is designated by the following abbreviations: Con. (contemplated), Prog. (in progress), Fin. (finished), Prin. (in press). Except in a few instances where the author did not supply complete data, the approximate time before completion and the probable length in octavo printed pages is indicated. Names of universities and colleges are italicized.

GENERAL

1. American agricultural history. Prog. 800 pp. 3 yrs. Gerald Forbes, *Northeastern* (Okla.) *State College.*
2. History of Virginia. Prog. Matthew Page Andrews, Baltimore.
3. The Southern colonies in the seventeenth century, 1607-1689. Prog. 350 pp. 2 yrs. Wesley F. Craven, *New York.*
4. The Southern colonies in the eigthteenth century, 1689-1763. Prog. 350 pp. 2 yrs. Philip Davidson, *Agnes Scott.*

5. A history of Tennessee. Prog. 600 pp. 2 yrs. Stanley J. Folmsbee, *Tennessee.*
6. The South in the American Revolution, 1763-1789. Prog. 350 pp. 3 yrs. Philip M. Hamer, The National Archives.
7. Founding the Southern system, 1789-1819. Prog. 350 pp. 3 yrs. Thomas P. Abernethy, *Virginia.*
8. The development of Southern sectionalism, 1819-1848. Prog. 350 pp. 2 yrs. Charles S. Sydnor, *Duke.*
9. The coming of the War between the States. Prog. 450 pp. 2 mos. Avery Craven, *Chicago.*
10. The growth of Southern nationalism, 1848-1861. Prog. 350 pp. 4 yrs. *Id.*
11. The Southern Confederacy, 1861-1865. Prog. 350 pp. 3 yrs. Charles W. Ramsdell, *Texas.*
12. Augusta, a city of the Confederacy. Prog. 200 pp. 2 yrs. William M. Robinson, Jr., Augusta, Ga.
13. The Confederacy and its aftermath as seen in judicial cases. Prog. 600 pp. 3 yrs. *Id.*
14. The South in Reconstruction, 1865-1880. Prog. 350 pp. 3 yrs. E. Merton Coulter, *Georgia.*
15. The origins of the New South, 1880-1913. Prog. 350 pp. 3 yrs. C. Vann Woodward, *Florida.*
16. The present South, 1913-1940. Prog. 350 pp. 4 yrs. Rupert Vance, *North Carolina.*

COLONIAL AND REVOLUTIONARY

(See also Nos. 3, 4, 6, 19, 40, 42)

17. The Royal colony of British West Florida. Prog. 300 pp. 6 mos. C. N. Howard, *California at Los Angeles.*
18. An analysis of democratic tendencies in the American states, 1775-1787. Prog. 500 pp. 4 yrs. Justin Williams, *State Teachers College,* River Falls, Wis.

POLITICAL

(See also Nos. 1, 12, 18, 33, 36, 37, 42, 49, 54, 57, 61)

19. Federal relations of Virginia, 1774-1789. Prog. Diss. L. W. Seegers, *Pennsylvania.*
20. Expansion of South Carolina, 1729-1765. Prog. 350 pp. 1 yr. Diss. *(Columbia)* R. L. Meriwether, *South Carolina.*
21. Sectionalism and internal improvements in Tennessee prior to 1840. Prin. Stanley J. Folmsbee, *Tennessee.*

22. The Southeastern frontier, 1800-1850. Prog. 1 yr. A. J. Hanna, *Rollins.*
23. Movements for secession in East Tennessee. Con. H. L. Swint, *Vanderbilt.*
24. The Know-Nothings in Virginia. Prog. Diss. L. J. Darter, *Pennsylvania.*
25. Economic forces in the Republican party. Fin. 300 pp. Diss. Madison Kuhn, *Chicago.*
26. Antislavery factors in the Republican party. Fin. 300 pp. Diss. Helen Cavanaugh, *Chicago.*
27. The secession movement in Tennessee, 1847-1861. Prog. 30 pp. 1 yr. Mary R. Campbell, Maryville, Tenn.
28. Tennessee and the Union, 1847-1861. Prog. 250 pp. 2 yrs. *Id.*
29. Attitude of the Republican party in the secession crisis of 1860-1861. Prog. 250 pp. 1 yr. Diss. *(Yale)* David M. Potter, Jr., *Rice.*
30. President Grant's attitude toward the South. Fin. Diss. Mrs. Bell Montgomery Tilghman, *Columbia.*
31. Disposition of Confederate property in England after the war. Prog. Diss. Carvel Painter, *Harvard.*
32. A life of John Jacobus Flournoy. Prog. 200 pp. 1 yr. E. Merton Coulter, *Georgia.*
33. Madame Le Vert: toast of Southern statesmen. Prog. 300 pp. 3 yrs. Rena Mazyck Andrews, *Huntingdon.*
34. Colonel Charles Pollard: Southern gentleman and railroad builder. Prog. 250 pp. 2 yrs. *Id.*
35. A life of Raphael Semmes. Prog. Alfred H. Bill, *Princeton.*
36. Governor Hugh S. Thompson, 1865-1900. Prog. 150 pp. 3 yrs. Diss. A. R. Childs, *South Carolina.*
37. John Sharp Williams, planter statesman of the Lower South. Fin. 600 pp. George C. Osborn, *Berry.*

SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND CULTURAL

(See also Nos. 1, 12, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 32, 33, 34, 56, 57, 61)

38. The Natchez Trace. Prog. 200 pp. 6 mos. Randle B. Truett, National Park Service.
39. The Natchez Trace; a historical survey. Fin. 250 pp. *Id.,* Ruth Butler, and O. T. Hagen, National Park Service.
40. Taxation in the provice of South Carolina. Prog. 1 yr. Diss. C. L. Epting, *South Carolina.*
41. Ante-bellum inns and taverns in the South. Prog. 1,000 pp. Randle B. Truett, National Park Service.

42. South Carolina during the Confederation period, 1781-1789. Prog. Diss. C. Gregg Singer, *Pennsylvania.*

43. Economic history of Tennessee. Prog. 300 pp. Claude A. Campbell, *Maryville,* and Mary R. Campbell, Maryville, Tenn.

44. The Bank of the State of South Carolina. Prog. 150 pp. 2 yrs. Diss. J. M. Lesesne, *South Carolina.*

45. History of Alabama public health movement. Prog. 300 pp. 18 mos. Carey V. Stabler, *Duke.*

46. A social and economic history of New Orleans, 1803-1860. Prog. 400 pp. 3 yrs. Howard P. Johnson, *Tulane.*

47. Branch banking in Tennessee. Fin. 25 pp. Claude A. Campbell, *Maryville.*

48. The Cotton Kingdom in Alabama: a study of the ante-bellum plantation system. Prin. 250 pp. Charles S. Davis, *Alabama Polytechnic.*

49. History of the Southwestern oil industry. Prog. 400 pp. 1 yr. Gerald Forbes, *Northeastern* (Okla.) *State College.*

50. The secession movement in Georgia, 1852-1861. Fin. 400 pp. Diss. *(Duke)* George V. Irons, *Howard.*

51. The power to fight—problems of the Confederacy. Fin. 250 pp. James L. Sellers, *Nebraska.*

52. Economic history of the Confederate states. Prog. 400 pp. 5 yrs. William M. Robinson, Jr., Augusta, Ga.

53. The Northern teacher in the South, 1860-1876. Prog. H. L. Swint, *Vanderbilt.*

54. Development of corporations in Tennessee, 1865-1875. Prog. 25 pp. 1 yr. Claude A. Campbell, *Maryville.*

55. Federal-state aid to agriculture in Alabama, 1900-1939. Con. 3 yrs. Charles S. Davis, *Alabama Polytechnic.*

EDUCATIONAL AND RELIGIOUS

56. History of the Church of England in British East and West Florida. Prog. 6 mos. Edgar L. Pennington, Miami, Fla.

DIPLOMATIC AND LEGAL

(See also Nos. 13, 31)

57. Criminal justice on the Kentucky frontier. Prog. Diss. A. Paul Gratiot, *Pennsylvania.*

58. Diplomatic missions of the United States to Cuba to secure the Spanish archives of Florida. Prin. A. J. Hanna, *Rollins.*

59. The celebrated case of the slave-ship *Wanderer*. Prog. 100 pp. 2 yrs. William M. Robinson, Jr., Augusta, Ga.
60. Justice-in-Grey: a history of the legal system in the Confederate States. Prin. 700 pp. *Id.*
61. The judicial machinery in North Carolina during Reconstruction. Prog. Diss. Kenneth St. Clair, *Ohio State.*
62. The New Orleans Mafia incident of 1891. Prog. J. Alexander Karlin, *Minnesota.*

MILITARY AND NAVAL

(See also Nos. 35, 38, 39)

63. History of the Confederate States' navy. Prog. 400 pp. 5 yrs. William M. Robinson, Jr., Augusta, Ga.
64. New Orleans under General Butler. Fin. Diss. *(Yale),* Howard P. Johnson, *Tulane.*

DOCUMENTS, COMPILATIONS, ETC.

65. A guide to the manuscript collections of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History. Prog. 600 pp. 2 yrs. William D. McCain, Mississippi Department of Archives and History.
66. A checklist of Mississippi government publications. Prog. 200 pp. 2 yrs. *Id.*
67. A checklist of Mississippi newspapers in the Mississippi Department of Archives and History. Prog. 500 pp. 1 yr. *Id.*
68. Manuscript sources for the history of Oklahoma. Prog. James W. Moffitt, Oklahoma Historical Society.
69. Selected speeches of John Sharp Williams. Fin. 600 pp. George C. Osborn, *Berry.*
70. Selected correspondence of Woodrow Wilson and John Sharp Williams. Fin. 400 pp. *Id.*
71. Social science maps of Tennessee. Prog. 4 yrs. Stanley J. Folmsbee and Clyde Amick, *Tennessee.*

INDEX

Abernethy, Thomas P., 7.
Amick, Clyde, 71.
Andrews, Matthew Page, 2.
Andrews, Rena Mazyck, 33, 34.
Bill, Alfred H., 35.
Butler, Ruth, 39.
Campbell, Claude A., 43, 47, 54.
Campbell, Mary R., 27, 28, 43.
Childs, A. R., 36.
Cavanaugh, Helen, 26.
Coulter, E. Merton, 14, 32.
Craven, Avery, 9, 10.

Craven, Wesley F., 3.
Darter, L. J., 24.
Davidson, Philip, 4.
Davis, Charles S., 48, 55.
Epting, C. L., 40.
Folmsbee, Stanley J., 5, 21, 71.
Forbes, Gerald, 1, 49.
Gratiot, A. Paul, 57.
Hagen, O. T., 39.
Hamer, Philip M., 6.
Hanna, A. J., 22, 58.
Howard, C. N., 17.
Irons, George V., 50.
Johnson, Howard P., 46, 64.
Karlin, J. Alexander, 62.
Kuhn, Madison, 25.
Lesesne, J. M., 44.
McCain, William D., 65, 66, 67.
Meriwether, R. L., 20.
Moffitt, James W., 68.
Osborn, George C., 37, 69, 70.
Painter, Carvel, 31.
Pennington, Edgar L., 56.
Potter, David M., Jr., 29.
Ramsdell, Charles W., 11.
Robinson, William M., Jr., 12, 13, 52, 59, 60, 63.
St. Clair, Kenneth, 61.
Seegers, L. W., 19.
Sellers, James L., 51.
Singer, C. Gregg, 42.
Stabler, Carey V., 45.
Swint, H. L., 23, 53.
Sydnor, Charles S., 8.
Tilghman, Mrs. Bell Montgomery, 30.
Truett, Randle B., 38, 39, 41.
Vance, Rupert, 16.
Williams, Justin, 18.
Woodward, C. Vann, 15.

CONTRIBUTORS

EDWIN ADAMS DAVIS is director of the Department of Archives and assistant professor of history at Louisiana State University.

THOMAS P. GOVAN is professor of history at the University of the South.

ROBERT DOUTHAT MEADE is professor of history at Randolph-Macon Woman's College.

FRANK J. KLINGBERG is professor of history at the University of California, Los Angeles.

WILLIAM DIAMOND is a graduate student in the department of history at Johns Hopkins University.

DAVID R. BARBEE is a journalist and historical investigator, Washington, D. C.

MILLEDGE L. BONHAM, JR., is professor of history at Hamilton College.

The Pacific Historical Review

A Scholarly Journal Devoted to the Entire Pacific Area

Official organ of the

PACIFIC COAST BRANCH OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

LOUIS KNOTT KOONTZ, MANAGING EDITOR
JOHN W. CAUGHEY, ASSOCIATE EDITOR
321 Administration Building, University of California at Los Angeles

BOARD OF EDITORS: Thomas A. Bailey, Dan E. Clark, W. Henry Cooke, Charles B. Fahs, Frederic L. Paxson, Walter N. Sage

Its current and back numbers contain a wealth of material on Australia and the Pacific islands, China and Japan, Alaska, the Canadian West, the American West, and the Pacific nations of Hispanic America.

EIGHTH YEAR OF PUBLICATION
$4.00 PER YEAR

A sample copy will be sent on request

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

William and Mary College Quarterly

Devoted to the publication of original contributions and documents relating to Virginia history

$1.00 A COPY.....$4.00 A YEAR

THOROUGHLY INDEXED

Published Quarterly by
William and Mary College
at WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

Editors

JOHN STEWART BRYAN
President of William and Mary College

E. G. SWEM
Librarian, William and Mary College

ANNOUNCING . . .

Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana

by

Roger Wallace Shugg

THIS STUDY undertakes to discover in the Old South the origins of the powerful class movements which resulted in the agrarian revolts of the nineties and in the more recent conflicts which have swept Louisiana and the rest of the South. The author has succeeded in isolating and examining as a class the white farmers and laborers of Louisiana during the crucial thirty-five-year period in which the issues of War and Reconstruction overshadowed all others. *xii, 372 pages. Cloth. Octavo. $3.50*

The Repressible Conflict 1830-1861

by

Avery O. Craven

THE TRADITIONAL issues over which the Civil War was fought are subjected to unsparing analysis in this book. The movement for abolition is interpreted as an economic crusade directed, not against the "peculiar institution" of slavery as it actually existed, but against slavery as the symbol of Southern agrarianism in conflict with Northern industrialism. *xii, 108 pages. Cloth. $1.50.*

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University—o—Louisiana

The JOURNAL *of* POLITICS

(A Quarterly Published by the Southern Political Science Association)

LEADING ARTICLES WHICH HAVE APPEARED IN THE FIRST FOUR NUMBERS INCLUDE:

George H. Sabine, "What Is a Political Theory?"
E. S. Corwin, "The President as Administrative Chief."
J. T. Salter, "The Pattern of Politics."
Francis G. Wilson, "Political Suppression in the Modern State."
Carl B. Swisher, "The Supreme Court in Transition."
Max A. Shepard, "An Analysis of Analytical Jurisprudence."
William Ebenstein, "The Fate of Co-operation under Fascism."

AMONG MATERIALS ON THE SOUTH ARE THE FOLLOWING:

J. B. Shannon, "Presidential Politics in the South"; Lee S. Greene, "Personnel Administration in the Tennessee Valley Authority"; Weldon Cooper, "The State Police Movement in the South."

Public administration has received attention in the above articles and other contributions.

In each issue a bibliographical article has appeared, each one reviewing recent developments in a certain field. Articles have been written by C. S. Hyneman, Taylor Cole and C. W. Smith, Jr. Regular book reviews are likewise published.

Subscription is $3.00 per year ($1.50 for students in residence). Mail to MANNING J. DAUER, MANAGING EDITOR, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA.

Manuscripts should be sent with return stamped envelope to ROBERT J. HARRIS, EDITOR, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY, LOUISIANA.

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

PRESIDENT

CHARLES S. SYDNOR, Duke University

VICE-PRESIDENT

FRANK L. OWSLEY, Vanderbilt University

SECRETARY-TREASURER

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL, University of Texas (1939)

THOMAS P. ABERNETHY, University of Virginia (1940)

PHILIP M. HAMER, The National Archives (1941)

MANAGING EDITOR

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

ELECTED MEMBERS

A. B. MOORE, University of Alabama (1939)

THOMAS S. STAPLES, Hendrix College (1939)

THOMAS D. CLARK, University of Kentucky (1940)

BENJAMIN B. KENDRICK, Woman's College of University of North Carolina (1940)

KATHRYN T. ABBEY, Florida State College for Women (1941)

AVERY O. CRAVEN, University of Chicago (1941)